

THE CHRISTIAN:
HIS CREED AND CONDUCT

WILLIAM EVANS



THE CHRISTIAN: HIS
CREED AND CONDUCT



THE CHRISTIAN: HIS CREED AND CONDUCT

By
WILLIAM EVANS, Ph. D., D. D.

Author of
"The Book of Books"
"Outline Studies in the Minor Prophets"
"How to Memorize"
"Personal Soul-Winning," Etc.



Chicago
The Bible Institute Colportage Association
826 North La Salle Street

THE CHRISTIAN
HIS CREED AND CONDUCT

WILLIAM ELLIS M. D. D.

COPYRIGHT, 1911,

BY

THE BIBLE INSTITUTE COLPORTAGE ASSOCIATION
OF CHICAGO

FOREWORD

IT will hardly be denied that the topics discussed in this volume are vital in relation to the Christian's life and experience; more vital, perchance, to the overwhelming majority of God's people, than problems more theological in their nature. Questions that affect the conduct of the disciple of Christ are always "live" questions, always "up to date," and never fail to stimulate a deep interest. The Christian—his amusements, love, engagement, marriage, the right or wrong of divorce, the matter of remarriage; his family life, the relation between husband and wife, parent and child; his business life and the principles controlling it; can there be problems more interesting and vital? With these and other problems of the Christian life this book deals.

These five addresses were given before the Union Bible Class of Chicago, to large and appreciative audiences. As nearly as possible the addresses are given as delivered, saving, however, that they have been curtailed in order to conform to the limits of a book of convenient size.

As God has already greatly blessed these messages to the many attendants of the Bible class, may He

FOREWORD

continue to make them a blessing to the larger number of people into whose hands it is hoped this volume will go.

WILLIAM EVANS.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.—THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS BIBLE.....	13
The Bible: what it is, and how it came to us—The book of God and religion—Sacred books—Inspired literature—Science and the Bible—Question of authority—Tracing the method of proof: Printed copies, manuscripts, quotations—Christ and the Scriptures.	
CHAPTER II.—THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS AMUSEMENTS	27
A vital question: Amusement has a place in the Christian's life—Various attitudes towards the question—Fundamental regulating principles—Recognized concessions—The principles stated and amplified—The theatre, dance, card table.	
CHAPTER III.—THE CHRISTIAN IN BUSINESS.....	59
What is meant by the Christian in business—Scripture teaching on the subject—Sphere and limitations, purpose and extent—The Christian and his money—Law of love, honesty, truthfulness—Indebtedness.	
CHAPTER IV.—THE CHRISTIAN AND THE FAMILY.	85
A Christian family—Engagement, marriage, divorce—Relation between husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant.	
CHAPTER V.—THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS FUTURE REWARD	113
The promise of the future—The Christian never dies—A glorified body—Shall we know our loved ones in heaven?—The Master's approval—Final reward.	

THE CHRISTIAN AND
HIS BIBLE

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS BIBLE.

The Bible: What It Is.

THE Bible is the Book of God and religion. There are other books, we are told, that reveal God to us besides the Bible; *e. g.*, the book of nature, and the book of providence. We admit that nature reveals God to us. That the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows His handiwork, we do not for a moment deny. Nature is vocal with theology. Nor would we think of contradicting the statement that God manifests Himself through history and providence. Victor Hugo said: "Waterloo was God." By that he meant that God showed His hand in that great war and turned the stream of civilization into another channel. The history of all nations is abundantly replete with marked interferences of God. Promotion cometh neither from the east nor from the west. It is God who setteth up one nation, and putteth down another.

The knowledge of God that comes to us from these sources, however, is not sufficient to fully satisfy the human heart. Nature tells us of God, but does not adequately describe Him to us. We might infer from the divine manifestations in history and providence that God is a great Force or Power, but such a definition of God by no means satisfies humanity. We need some other and deeper vision of God. We need to know something about His person, nature and attri-

butes; His relations with His creatures; what things are pleasing and what displeasing to Him; what are His ethical, moral, and spiritual standards. To these questions not nature, nor history, nor yet providence affords an answer. Nature may show the head and wisdom of God, and providence and history the hand and power of God, but we need a revelation such as we have in the Bible to reveal to us the heart and the grace of our God.

Sometimes the Bible is compared with other sacred books—bibles of other religions: the Koran, the Vedas, etc. There can be no real comparison. The Bible is not to be put on the same plane as these books. None of them claim for themselves what the Bible claims for itself; nor did any one of their authors claim for himself what Jesus Christ, and the inspired writers of the Bible claim for themselves. The Christian must be very careful in the matter of comparing his Bible with other sacred books. Such comparison is attended with grave danger. There is practically no difference, so far as the disastrous effects of such comparisons are concerned, whether you drag the Bible down to the level of these other books, or lift these other books up to the level of the Bible. The effect is the same; you rob the Bible of its unique character and authority. Let us be careful in this matter.

THE BIBLE IS THE BOOK FROM GOD.

The Bible is not only the book *of* God, it is also the book *from* God. At least this is the way in which it gives its own account of its origin: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,"—that is to say, is "God-breathed" (2 Timothy 3:16). Again, in 2 Peter 1:20, 21, we read: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation (or origin, for it seems clear that it is to the *source* rather

than to the exposition of the Scripture that reference is here made). For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Here are some very clear and definite statements concerning the source of the Scripture. It is this "God-breathed" element that differentiates this Book from all other writings. The Bible is quite often referred to nowadays as splendid "*literature*." Well, the Bible is that, but it is more than that—it is *Scripture*. Literature is the letter; Scripture is the letter inbreathed by the Holy Spirit. Just as in the creation of man we learn that man became a living soul when that frame of dust, as it lay on the ground, became inbreathed by the Spirit of life from God. Man is dust inbreathed by Deity; and if you take away the spirit of life from man, he returns to dust. So is it with the Bible: it is the letter, but it is the letter inbreathed by God's Spirit that makes that letter Scripture. And when you rob the Bible of its inspiration you have nothing but mere literature left—you have no Scripture.

THE BIBLE IS THE BOOK OF RELIGION.

Religion is defined as communion between God and man. The Bible begins with God and ends with man, and the middle verse of the Bible brings God and man together.

The message of the Bible is a *religious* message. Its aim and purpose is to bring man, who has been estranged from God by reason of his sin, back to the God from whom he has been estranged. The Scriptures, which are given by inspiration of God, are for the man of God, that he may be instructed in righteousness; mark you, in *righteousness*, not in science, or art, or poetry, or history, important as these things are in themselves. We come to the Bible to find God. True,

the Scriptures deal with facts scientific, historic, and philosophic; but these are incidental; they are by no means the main purpose of the Book. The purpose of the Bible is to teach us how to go to heaven, not how the heavens go—and there is a vast difference between these two things. Many people come to the Bible for wrong things: for science, geology, philosophy, history, etc. It has all such things within its covers, to be sure. And, further, when it does make scientific statements they are to be considered accurate, even though it does speak in the language of appearances rather than of scientific accuracy—just as we say the sun rises and sets, whereas in point of fact it neither rises nor sets. Such an eminent authority as the late Prof. Charles Dana, of Yale, as also Prof. Agassiz, of Harvard, said that he knew nothing in science that invalidated in the least degree the teachings of the Bible. But granting all this, we must not forget that we come to the Bible to know what to do with the problem of our sin; to find out how to be just with a holy and righteous God; to discover the secret of a life holy and well-pleasing to God, and to learn something of our origin, possibilities, and destiny.

THE BIBLE THE AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF FAITH AND PRACTICE.

Where is the seat of authority in matters of religion? This is always the problem of the day. Various replies are given to the question.

Reason, says one, is the seat of final authority. May not the intellect with its various functions be relied upon to render sure judgments? One has only to recall the grotesque fancies that have from time to time taken hold of the finest and brainiest men and led them into the grossest delusions to satisfy himself that the seat of authority does not lie in the reason. Not that

we are to throw reason away in matters of religion; for while faith is oftentimes above reason, it is by no means contrary to it. The voice of reason, however, is not to be considered final and authoritative.

Can we not depend upon *Conscience*, that organ as delicate and sensitive as the balance turned by a speck of dust, to admonish us of evil, to praise us for the good, and settle for us the right and wrong of matters religious? We have but to recall into what incalculable mischief the consciences of some men have led them—Saul of Tarsus, for example—to speedily recognize that we must look elsewhere for our authority. "In all good conscience men have written deadly heresies in their books, and under the sanctions of a religious conscience have performed deeds of violence and shame."

There are people who claim that the *church* is the ultimate authority in matters of faith and practice. This is the position of the Roman Church. Called of God, divinely founded, with perpetual witnesses to the truth, with bishops and councils—surely the church is a sufficient guide. Yet what enormities have flourished under the banner of the church! So long as she is composed of fallible human beings the church can never be final and authoritative in matters of faith and practice.

On every hand we hear the cry: "*Back to Christ*"; He, and He alone, is the final and ultimate authority in all these matters. We certainly have no desire to take any glory away from the church's Lord and Master in order to give it to so sacred a Book even as the Bible. We are willing to go "*back to Christ*." But where shall we find Him? With the exception of a reference in Josephus and a line or two in Tacitus where, outside of the Bible, shall we find Christ? So we see that in order to "*get back to Christ*" we are in duty bound to fall back upon the Scriptures.

For our Master Himself the *Scriptures* were considered sufficient authority in matters of faith and practice. It would repay anyone to look up all the passages in which these words of the Master occur, "Is it not written?" "Have ye not read?" "What saith the Scriptures?" "It is written." A careful study of such Scripture references will reveal the fact that Christ referred to the Scriptures as the authority which settled matters of faith and practice for *Him*. Should the Bible be less to the church than it was to the church's Master? We think not.

A Roman Catholic priest on being asked to prove that the church, *i. e.*, the Roman Catholic church, is the final authority, referred the inquirer to Matthew 16:18, 19: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock," etc., saying: "There is my authority for claiming authority for my church." Do you not see the ludicrousness of his position—he had to get back to the Scriptures for authority to prove that his church had any authority, and so the Bible, in the last analysis, was the final authority.

How Our Bible Came to Us.

The Bible, as we have it today, can be traced back to its original sources. To substantiate this claim let us follow certain lines of proof.

PRINTED COPIES.

First, there is the proof from *printed copies* of the Bible. Printed copies of the Scriptures are extant today, dating as far back as the middle of the fifteenth century. In the library of Exeter college, Oxford, there is a copy of the Old Testament in Hebrew, dated A. D. 1488. In the Royal Library, Berlin, there is a Hebrew copy of the Old Testament, dated A. D. 1494. It was from this copy that Luther made his German

translation of the Scriptures. There are extant printed copies of the New Testament in Greek, dated Basil, A. D., 1516, and edited by Erasmus; in Latin, dated A. D., 1514. These printed copies on being compared agree in the main with the printed copies of the Bible we possess in this year of our Lord, 1911. Thus we prove, by a single step, the Old and the New Testaments, in the form we have them now to have existed *four hundred years ago*. This evidence is open to the investigation of both Christian and skeptic.

MANUSCRIPTS.

But if the printed copies of the Bible take us back to the middle of the fifteenth century, the question may be asked, what are you going to do about all the centuries between the fifteenth and the days of the apostles? This question, difficult as it may seem, is not impossible to answer. There are *manuscripts* of the Scriptures which take us back to the middle of the *fourth century*. At the time the first printed copy of the Bible was issued there were in the possession of Christian scholars no less than two thousand such manuscripts—certainly a sufficient number to establish the integrity of the sacred text. If, which is certainly true, scholars are willing to accept ten or twenty copies at most of any classical writer as proving the genuineness and authenticity of his writings, how much more ought we to be willing to admit the same for the Scriptures with over *two thousand* manuscripts! All these manuscripts, when compared, agree with the printed copies of the Scriptures which we possess today.

The question may be asked, "Why do these manuscripts date back as far only as the fourth century?" The answer may be found in the historic fact that in the year A. D. 302, the Emperor Diocletian ordered the wholesale destruction of the sacred books. Again it

should be remembered that in the year A. D., 330, the Emperor Constantine ordered a large number of copies of the sacred Scriptures to be made for use in the churches of his day. This accounts for the large number of manuscripts dating from the fourth century.

The manuscripts we are here speaking of contain, separately, but parts of the Scriptures; when put together and compared, however, they contain the whole Bible. Indeed, some of them contain the New Testament in full. Thus we see, that, as far back as the middle of the fourth century, the same Bible as that which we have in 1911 was in existence. *The Bible of the fourth* and the twentieth centuries are one and the same.

CHURCH FATHERS.

We are still, however, especially so far as the New Testament is concerned, about three or four hundred years removed from the lifetime of the writers of the New Testament. How can we bridge this gulf? Again is this task made easy by indisputable historic facts. From the time of the death of the Apostle John, about 100 A. D., until about the fourth century, there arose in the Christian church certain apologists and defenders of the truth of the Christian religion. These men are known as "The Church Fathers." In their religious controversies with the enemies of Christianity, as well as in their letters of instruction to Christians and churches, they made constant use of Scripture quotations. These are called the "*Quotations of the Church Fathers.*" These quotations were made with great exactness. Indeed many of them are given verbatim. *So numerous are these quotations that were the New Testament blotted out of existence it could be restored entire, excepting eleven verses, from the "Quotations of the Church Fathers."*

APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

Between the "Church Fathers" and the apostles themselves, however, another gap occurs which is filled in by the "Apostolic Fathers": *i. e.*, by men who were alive before the last of the apostles passed away. Polycarp, A. D. 70-150, a disciple of the Apostle John, and Clement, of Rome, who was doubtless a companion of Paul (Philippians 4:3), were among the "Apostolic Fathers." References are made to every part of the New Testament in the writings of these men. The New Testament must therefore have been in existence at the time of their writing.

Thus step by step we are able to prove that the Bible (the New Testament at least—the Old we shall consider later) as we have it today is the same as that which existed in the days of the apostles. Our faith in God's Word rests upon no cunningly devised fables; it rests upon evidence, and any earnest, seeking soul can gain access to such evidence if he so desires. An earnest, intelligent search in the public reference libraries of any of our large cities will corroborate the truth here set forth.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

No doubt should now be left in our minds regarding the genuineness of the New Testament. But how about the Old Testament? Is the evidence for its genuineness and authenticity as abundant and convincing? Let us see.

CHRIST'S TESTIMONY.

Christ had the Old Testament in His possession. No one can read the Gospels carefully without being impressed with Christ's marvelous knowledge of the Old Testament. Not only in His defense during the wilderness temptation, but throughout His entire

career, the Master showed a remarkable familiarity with the Hebrew Scriptures.

Were these Scriptures the same as we have them today?

That Christ constantly refers to the Sacred Writings, there can be no doubt. If one should go through the Gospels and mark every reference made by Christ to the Old Testament, it would be found that a very large number of the Old Testament books were referred to and quoted by Him. Now, if this be true, as it undoubtedly is, then it is self-evident that the books quoted from were in existence in our Lord's day.

Further, it is to be noted that our Lord not only quoted largely and freely from the Old Testament Scriptures, but that He referred to the sacred volume, as a whole, as possessing the same divisions into which we divide it today—"the law, the prophets, and the psalms."

"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.

"And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the *law of Moses* and in the *prophets*, and in the *psalms*, concerning me." (Luke 24:27 and 44.)

There is no just reason to doubt that the Old Testament, as we have it today, was in existence in our Lord's day.

TESTIMONY OF APOSTLES.

The apostles and writers of the New Testament possessed the Old Testament as we have it today. When Paul speaks of the "Scriptures," which Timothy had known from a child, he refers to the Old Testament. Peter's reference to the "Scriptures coming not in old time by the will of man," and John's allusion to "the

Scriptures being fulfilled," all point to the Old Testament.

The quotations from and allusions to the Old Testament in the New are of a surprisingly large number. The direct quotations amount to 263. The allusions or references that are less direct number 376, making a total of 639. There are ninety quotations from the Pentateuch, and references to it which amount to over one hundred. The Psalms are directly quoted from seventy-one times, references and allusions being made to them upwards of thirty times. The Prophecy of Isaiah is directly quoted from fifty-six times, being referred and alluded to forty-eight times. The Minor Prophets are quoted from and referred to about thirty times.

THE SEPTUAGINT.

It is very evident from the above mentioned testimony that there was in the days of the apostles and Christ the Old Testament as we have it today. Indeed, it can be clearly proven that the Old Testament existed even before our Lord's day. An edition of the Hebrew Scriptures translated into the Greek language and called "The Septuagint Version," was in existence two hundred and eighty-five years before our Lord's birth. According to tradition this version was translated from the Hebrew by seventy-two Jews, each of whom, in a separate cell, made a complete translation of the entire Old Testament. This translation was made in Alexandria at about the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus (B. C. 285). There is no need at this time for a discussion of the manner in which this translation of the Hebrew Scriptures was made. It is sufficient for the present purpose to know that as far back as the year B. C. 285 there was a copy of the Old Testament Scriptures, copies of which exist today, and which, on

being compared, agree as to the matter, form and structure with the last copy of the Old Testament, which left the press in the year 1911.

From the evidence we have submitted it can truly be said that the entire Bible as we have it today is indeed and in truth the very Word of God, written by the men whose names it bears, and with the text essentially unchanged, as genuine and authentic as it was when it left the hands of the sacred writers.

How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,
Is laid for your faith in His excellent Word !

“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. Forever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in Heaven.” In this day of crumbling creeds and confessions ; in this day when men are not satisfied with the simple sound of the Gospel trumpet, but seek a gospel with variations ; in this day when the exclamation mark of faith is being displaced by the interrogation mark of doubt and unbelief, it is a grand and glorious thing for the Christian to know that the Word of God standeth sure.

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS
AMUSEMENTS

CHAPTER II.

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS AMUSEMENTS.

THERE is scarcely any phase of Christian life and experience that is of more practical importance to the believer in Christ who is seeking to conscientiously serve his Lord and Master than that which deals with the question of right and wrong amusements. One is constantly asked as to whether this or that form of amusement is proper or improper for a Christian. The question of amusements for the Christian is one that cannot be lightly cast aside. It is a problem that must be faced.

WHAT IS MEANT BY AMUSEMENTS?

Generally speaking, we understand the term. Briefly, therefore, by amusement is meant that which cheers, diverts, entertains, and delights, such as fun, frolic, pastime, sport, recreation and merriment. Amusement may be spasmodic, periodic, or sustained; it may last a minute, an hour, a day, or even longer; it may turn our attention to a thing which amuses us, or divert our attention from a thing which unduly engrosses us. Some amusements, like sports, appeal to the body; others, like entertainments, occupy the attention of the mind; others again, appealing to neither body nor mind in particular, are, as their names indicate, mere pastimes, made to while away the time. Speaking more lightly, by amusement is meant that which occupies our time usually after the day's work is done—what a man does after six o'clock at night, and on holidays.

THE PLACE OF AMUSEMENT IN HUMAN LIFE.

That amusement has a place in life there can be no serious question. Life is not meant to be one round of serious work. There is a time to laugh, a time to play, and a time to dance. The Creator did not intend that any one of his creatures should be a hermit, an ascetic, a stoic. An overwound watch-spring snaps, so does an overworked brain, evidences of which we see all around us. There need to be pauses and parentheses in our lives. Not always are we to be on the stretch; we must allow a little slack in the rope; we must loosen up occasionally. Our tired nerves need relaxation; our over-taxed minds need diversion; our over-wrought imagination needs entertainment; the waste tissue of our physical organism needs recreation. Frolic and fun, pastime and pleasure are needed to relieve us from the stress and strain of the life we are called upon to live in this strenuous age. Many of us do not have enough vacation days in our life of labor and toil; we should give more time than we do to play.

The Christian life is not to be devoid of amusement. Christianity is to be considered as being in no sense hostile to pleasure and recreation. It rejoices not in melancholy, takes no pleasure in the sombre countenance, and places no premium upon the monk, the ascetic, and the hermit; it quenches no laugh, suppresses no smile, extinguishes no happiness; on the contrary, in its presence is fulness of joy, and at its right hand there are pleasures for evermore.

How tasteless and tedious the hours,
 When Jesus no longer I see;
 Sweet fields, sweet birds, and sweet flowers
 Have all lost their sweetness for me;
 The midsummer sun shines but dimly,
 The flowers no longer look gay;
 But when I am happy in Jesus,
 December's as pleasant as May.

It has been said that Jesus Christ never laughed. This statement may be rightly questioned. The children never would have flocked to Him as they did if He had not had a smiling face. That He was the opposite of John the Baptist, the stern ascetic, is clearly evident from Christ's own words: "We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced. . . . John came neither eating nor drinking. . . . The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold, a man gluttonous, and a winebibber." His counsel to the disciples to the effect that when they fasted they should not go about with long faces and in mournful garb as the hypocrites did, but on the contrary, that they should anoint their faces, and put on a cheerful countenance—all this indicates, we feel sure, that Jesus was always inculcating happiness and a cheery disposition. Christ wept, it is true, but He wept that we might laugh, just as He died that we might live. His sorrow was our joy, true; but his joy was always full and running over. When the disciples returned from a wonderfully successful evangelistic tour, He is said to have burst forth into rapturous joy (Luke 10:21), just such a joy as filled the soul of Mary, His mother, when she broke out in that glad Magnificat.

Christianity recognizes the universality of the desire for play and amusement. What God has planted in the heart of every man, namely, the desire for play; what is so universal, can hardly be sinful.

There are, even among Christians, people of an ascetic temperament, who seem to think that it is almost wicked to laugh and play. They seem to delight in quoting the words of the Apostle, "I die daily," "I am crucified with Christ." They seem to forget that while the Apostle said, "I am crucified with Christ," he also said, "Nevertheless I live." To this veteran Christian disciple Christianity was a thing of life not

death. It is wrong for the Christian to set himself against the element of amusement in life. We should recognize that a desire that God Himself has planted so deeply and so universally in our nature He intends that we should satisfy. Amusement in the life of the Christian should be regulated, true—but it should not by any means be suppressed.

DIFFERENT PEOPLE ASSUME DIFFERENT ATTITUDES
TOWARDS AMUSEMENTS.

Some persons say, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." In other words the philosophy of these people—some one has named it "the philosophy of the pig-sty"—is this: Let us live for pleasure; let us get out of life all the amusement we can, no matter whether it is helpful or harmful. Their one thought on waking, and throughout the whole of the day is this: where, and in what can we get the most pleasure.

The whole matter of amusement is treated lightly and flippantly by many. Certain forms of amusement, like the theatre and the dance, are singled out and compared with certain faults or sins. "It is just as bad to slander," they tell us, "as it is to go to the theatre, and to be self-righteous as it is to play cards." "It is just as harmful for some people to eat cheese as it is for others to drink beer." They tell us that "Christians condemn the world for doing certain things, and yet they themselves do other things that are just as bad."

Still others are careless and indifferent about the whole matter. They manifest a kind of don't-care spirit: "I am going to sow my wild oats and let the consequences take care of themselves."

Fortunately there are many people who are more serious and are found constantly inquiring into the matter as to whether certain forms of amusement are

right, moral, and uplifting in their influence, and whether or not a Christian should engage in them. Many such totally abstain from certain forms of popular amusements lest their example should be a stumbling-block to others. This is certainly a noble and Christ-like thing to do, and such self-denial is praiseworthy.

THE AMUSEMENTS OF THE CHRISTIAN ARE TO BE REGULATED AND MODIFIED BY CERTAIN CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES.

There can be no question but that the advent of Christ into any man's life does change the attitude of that man towards amusements. Indeed, his attitude towards life in all its aspects is changed. He has become "a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things have become new." He has new companions, new affections, new desires, new emotions, new pleasures. The impulsive power of a new affection now controls his whole being. It is only natural, therefore, to expect that his attitude towards amusements should be influenced by his conversion. From henceforth he is to be separated from the world, nor is he any longer to be conformed to its ways and fashions. "Love not the world . . . the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life" is a command of love he feels constrained to obey.

Let us examine somewhat closely these fundamental Christian principles which regulate and modify the amusements of the follower of Christ. But before doing so may we be allowed to make certain admissions which a fair treatment of the subject demands.

The Christian while distinguishing between harmful and harmless amusements yet recognizes: First, that even Christians sometimes *differ* as to the harm and ill-effects of certain forms of amusement. In thus

differing we should be able to do so without any abuse or recrimination, and without impeaching each other's character. Secondly, that the evil consequences usually following in the wake of certain forms of amusement have not *always* followed them in certain and particular cases. Indeed, that, sometimes, in homes where the strictest discipline, with reference to the matter of amusements, has been maintained, from these very homes have gone forth those who have become abject slaves to the amusements they had been warned to shun. And, contrariwise, that, from homes in which there has been perfect freedom, and even license, with regard to these things, there have gone forth men and women who have totally abstained from further participation in such amusements. Thirdly, that while this is undoubtedly true, yet, the subject is too big to be judged by these *exceptional cases*—for exceptional they are. Our judgment regarding these things is to be made with regard to their *general trend and tendency*; by this we are to be guided in our estimation of the harm or innocency of any particular form of amusement. Fourthly, that certain forms of amusement may be perfectly harmless when conducted under restricted circumstances and conditions. But even here we must recognize the almost universal tendency to break down these restrictions. So that the real question is not what these amusements *should be*, nor what they *might be*, if restricted, but what they *really are*.

We are now ready to examine the fundamental Christian principles which are to regulate and modify the amusements of the Christian. And will you remember that we are here dealing with principles, not laws. No laws can be framed that will successfully control the amusement question. Man will break every law you make. And, further, what might be a law under given conditions to one person, could not, in the very nature

of the case, and under different circumstances, be a law unto another. Laws are human, principles are divine; we make laws, principles are laid down for us. Laws are transitory and shifting, principles are unchanging and eternal. Says Sir Arthur Helps: "There are no two words that are used so confusedly as rule and principle. You can make a rule, you cannot make a principle. You can lay down a rule, you cannot, properly speaking, lay down a principle; it is laid down for you. You may establish a rule, you cannot establish a principle; you can only declare it. Rules are in your power, principles are not." What will you say to a young man who asks you why it is right to play croquet and yet wrong to play billiards, why he may play authors and yet not cards? Can you lay down any law for him? Certainly not; for there is no law that will fit his case. What can you do? Declare to him principles. This is all, and it is the best you can do for him.

THE MODIFYING CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLES.

First: *The true Christian will realize the true relation that should exist between work and pleasure.*

If life is not to be one round of work, it most certainly is not to be all one round of pleasure. Work, not amusement, is the chief end of man. Let us not miss this point—work, not amusement, is the business of life. God has laid upon every man the necessity of work, and for this reason has distributed "to every man his work." Is it not just in this connection that we may be justified in finding fault with the professional sport, the man who gives up his whole life to pleasure. When the main thing in college and university life is athletics are we not justified in protesting that life's main purpose is being lost sight of? Play and amusement is but a side issue in life; when it

becomes the whole thing, then it is harmful and sinful, no matter whether the amusement in question be in the forbidden category or not; then even an innocent amusement becomes morally bad. Amusement is to work what whetting the scythe is to harvesting: he who never stops to create an edge toils hard and cuts but little, while he who whets the scythe all day cuts none. If the mother enjoys amusements more than she does her children, the wife more than her domestic duties, the husband more than his home, the man more than his labor, and the student more than his books, then amusements are harmful and wrong.

Second: *The true Christian will see to it that his amusements are really recreative and not dissipative.*

A man may lie so long in a bath that he comes out of it all exhausted, or he can take a plunge or shower and come out all the better prepared for the duties of life. So is it with amusements: they may dissipate rather than recreate. Having a good time is not always recreation; it may be just the opposite. The amusements of the Christian should build up lost tissue, rest the tired body and rejuvenate the jaded mind, ~~they~~ must build up the whole man—physically, mentally, morally and spiritually.

The Christian's pleasures will recreate *physically*. The body of the Christian is the temple of the Holy Ghost. It is incumbent upon him therefore that he keep his body in as good, clean, pure, and healthy a condition as possible. The body needs relaxation; it needs rest from the strain and tension of life; it needs new blood, new nerve tissues; it needs, by means of recreation, to be better fitted for the real tasks that lie within its sphere of labor. Bad thinking often comes from lack of exercise, and much of our bad theology has come from a bad physical condition. Some people do not have enough body "to cover the mind

with decency." There may be a time when it is my duty to play rather than pray, to romp rather than read my Bible, to take a good brisk walk rather than prepare a good Gospel talk.

The test the Christian must apply to his pleasures is this: do they recreate and restore the waste tissues of the body. Excess in athletics is not recreation. Young men have died from over-strain in running; girls have been ruined for life by excessive rope-jumping. Many pleasures dissipate the powers of the body instead of recreating them.

Apply such a test to certain forms of popular amusements prevalent today: the theatre, the dance, the card party. Do they recreate, or do they dissipate? Do they violate the laws of physical health by their late hours, their impure atmosphere, their mode of dress and conduct, or are they perfectly consistent with the observance of the laws of good health and hygiene? If these amusements violate the laws of health, then until such times as they can be brought within the realm of recreative pleasures the Christian must place them on the forbidden list.

The pleasures of the Christian should recreate *mentally*, as well as bodily. The physical must not be developed at the expense of the mental. Giantism must by no means supplant intellectualism. Mind is greater than body, as Gladstone and Bismarck are greater than John L. Sullivan or James Jeffreys. The Christian must ask himself, therefore, "What effect do my pleasures and amusements have upon my mind, my thought, my thinking? Do they build up, ennoble, purify, sanctify; or do they debase, befoul, besmirch, debauch? Is my thinking higher, nobler, more God-like because of the pleasures in which I engage?"

All things are not to be judged by the eye; the mind discerns also. Shakespeare speaks of the man "who

hath a body filled with a vacant mind, gets him to rest crammed with distressful bread."

My mind to me my kingdom is;
Such present joys therein I find,
That it excels all other bliss
That earth affords, or grows by kind;
Though much I want, which most would have,
Yet still my mind forbids to crave.

1 The Christian is to judge his amusements by this standard. Apply this principle to literature? What books do we read? If the Christian's Master should inquire: "What readest thou?" what would be our reply? Beware lest our minds become diseased by the reading of light and trashy literature.

7 Judge the theatre by this standard. Someone has said: "The laugh of the theater is the laugh that speaks of the vacant mind." "The leafless desert of the mind; the waste of feelings unemployed."—Byron. Are we purer in thought, more virtuous in our dreams, sweeter in our imaginations; have we more earnest views of life; is the mind sensualized or spiritualized by attendance upon the theatre?

Apply this test to the card table. Does this popular amusement furnish recreation to the mind? With its passion, its tenseness, its excitement, its late hours, does the game of chance rest and quicken the faculties for the labors of the next day? Does not the game rather dissipate than recreate the mind?

Apply this standard to dancing. Some have said that one does not need any brains for dancing, unless it be in the heels and the toes. Do the atmosphere, the passion, the whirl and dazzling fascination, the late hours—do all these recreate or dissipate, which? On the right answer to this question depends the right or wrong of this amusement for the Christian. There can be but one answer to this question surely.

Nor is the *moral and spiritual* effect of the Christian's pleasures to be lost sight of. Indeed, this is the test paramount, the court of final appeal. Remember what Spenser says:

The body from the soul its form doth take;
For the soul is form, and doth the body make.

Whenever, therefore, any pleasure invades the moral and spiritual nature, then it is time to call a halt. Whenever any amusement in which the Christian engages interferes with his duty to God, to Christ, and the church it is high time to stop and consider the propriety of such pleasures. Whatever unfits for devotion, for the enjoyment of prayer and the reading of the Bible, cannot, by any process of reasoning, be made to appear to the advantage of any follower of Jesus Christ. When it becomes necessary to break the Sabbath day in order to satisfy a desire for pleasure and amusement, it is time to realize that no pleasure that calls for such sacrifice of principle can be legitimate and really profitable.

Third. The great principle that is to govern and control the Christian in his amusements: *The appeal to the Christian conscience.*

Paul, in Romans 14:22, 23, says: "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth. And he that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin." The entire chapter is taken up with the discussion of the question of the Christian's attitude towards questionable things—things which, by some people, are considered wrong, and by others, right. So far as the believer's own personal relation to Christ is concerned—leaving out altogether for the moment the matter of one's influence by such action—he must see to it that his conscience is altogether clear on the right or wrong

of the question involved. It is a personal and individual matter between him and his Lord. What others may or may not be able to do is not to be the deciding factor in his case, but what he can do with a clear conscience in the presence of his Lord. If there is the slightest *doubt* as to whether a thing is right or wrong, that is evidence sufficient for the Christian to lead him to refrain altogether from that particular thing until the matter is definitely settled one way or another. "Whatsoever is not of faith" means whatsoever one cannot do with a perfectly clear conscience. If I practice what my conscience condemns, then I am sinning just as much as if there were a definite commandment prohibiting the practice of the thing I am doing. This is vital for the Christian to understand.

NOTE Why do Christians ask, "Is it wrong to go to the theatre, or to play cards, or to dance?" Why, if not because there is a *conscientious doubt* about the matter? Why not ask if it is wrong to pray, or to read the Bible, or to go to church? In settling the question of the right or wrong of certain amusements the Christian must make his appeal to his conscience, and inquire as to whether such pleasures meet with the approval of this vice-regent of God in the soul. To do anything, to go anywhere, to play any game, or indulge in any pleasure, no matter of what sort it is, which the conscience condemns is to commit sin in the doing thereof.

The fourth great principle which should govern the Christian in his amusements: The influence of his example upon others.

In order that we may understand the Scriptural teaching on this phase of the subject, quite a full quotation from the 14th chapter of Romans is here given. This passage will enable us to see what attitude the great Apostle took in matters concerning which there were conscientious differences of opinion.

14 I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself; but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean.

15 But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.

16 Let not then your good be evil spoken of:

17 For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

18 For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men.

19 Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

20 For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure; but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence.

21 It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.

The principle that "No man liveth to himself," cannot be cast aside by anyone, much less by the Christian who, more than others, is to consider the bearing of his actions upon the life and character of others, lest, by his liberty, he becomes a stumbling-block to those who are weak. This is especially true when we remember that the problem we are here dealing with is not so much an ethical as a Christian one. The Christian is responsible for the influence he exerts whether he wills it or not. There is no law in heaven, on earth, or in hell that grants the Christian the privilege of engaging in any amusement that brings havoc into the life of his brother man. "Look out for number one, and let the other fellow look out for himself," is not to be the motto of the Christian, even though it should be popular in the world's philosophy.

But, you ask, is not this giving up one's rights? Has the Christian no rights of his own? May he not do as he pleases without respect to what others think of him or his conduct? In reply: Did Jesus reason this way? Did He ever claim any rights? On the contrary did He not often forfeit His rights for the welfare of others? Yes, the Christian has certain rights: it is always his right to give up anything that may be a stumbling-block to a weaker brother. "Even Christ

pleased not Himself"; nor should His disciples. The Christian may be able to do certain things without feeling that they are sinful so far as he himself is concerned. This is not the end of the matter, however. The disciple of Christ will ask himself, What is the effect of my action upon the life and conduct of others?

One day a young man called upon his minister and asked:

"Pastor, is it a sin for me, as a Christian, to use tobacco; can I be a Christian, and smoke?"

"That is a question somewhat difficult to answer," replied the pastor. "I suppose a man can be a Christian, and use tobacco. He may be such a Christian as Mr. Moody describes: 'a dirty Christian,' but I suppose he can be a Christian, nevertheless. But why do you ask the question?"

"Because," said the young man, "one year ago I became a Christian, and surrendered my whole life to Jesus Christ. During the last month or so I have been troubled in my conscience every time I have used tobacco."

"Then," said the pastor, "if your conscience troubles you about the matter, and convinces you that it is wrong, it is wrong and sinful for you to continue in this thing, even though all other Christians are able to do it."

Under the advice of the pastor, the young man, there and then, surrendered this habit of years to Christ, and emptying his pockets of cigars and cigarettes, he cast them all away.

A few minutes after this the pastor and this young man were walking down the street and, passing a church, they saw a company of men coming out of the church. Among them was a preacher known to both this young man and the pastor. On coming out of the

church this preacher struck a match and lighted a cigar, and walked away puffing the smoke vigorously from his cigar.

"See there," said this young man who had just made the surrender of the thing which had brought his conscience into bondage, "there's a preacher smoking; if he can do it, why can't I? And I am going to do it." He turned away from the pastor and from the church, too; for he gave up the Christian life after that.

Now while we may say that that young man was foolish in taking any man for his example, and that the preacher may have had a perfectly clear conscience about the matter of smoking, we cannot blind ourselves to the fact that the preacher's example meant the ruin of that young man. This is what the Apostle meant when he said: "And through thy knowledge, the weaker brother perish, for whom Christ died." And when we so sin against our brother we sin against Christ. What influence do your pleasures have upon those with whom you come in contact?

The fifth great principle which is to control and modify the amusements of the Christian: *The submission of the whole matter to Christ for His approval.*

Some time ago a young woman came to speak with her pastor regarding the question of amusements. She was quite troubled about the matter, and, according to her own confession, had tried hard for months to settle whether it was right or wrong for her, as a Christian, to attend the theatre. The pastor told her that he thought the problem could be solved in a very few moments. This statement came to the young woman with somewhat of a surprise. How could a question which for months she had tried to settle, and without success, how could a question in such dispute among even Christians, how could such a question be settled definitely within a few minutes? True, the ques-

tion could not be settled in a broad and general sense so that all Christendom would be governed by it, but, so far as this young woman herself was concerned in her relation to the matter in question, it could most assuredly be settled, and that at once. The Bible was then opened to Colossians 3:17, which reads: "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him."

"Now," said the pastor, "we are here commanded to submit all our actions to Jesus Christ for His approval, and to see to it that they are an expression of thankfulness to God. Let us kneel and pray."

The Bible, opened at Colossians 3:17, was placed on the floor and the young woman asked to kneel down beside that passage of Scripture, and to follow her pastor in this prayer:

"O, Lord, thou hast commanded us to submit all things to Thee for Thine approval, and that we should do all things to Thy glory, giving thanks to Thee. Now, Father, this young woman desires to submit the matter of her amusements to Thee. She wants to give Thee thanks for the theatre, believing that she can glorify Thee there, that it is a proper place in which a Christian should spend her time and that her attendance at the theatre will strengthen her influence for Thee,—"

Just then the pastor felt a hand on his shoulder, and the young woman said:

"Pastor, please do not pray like that any more, for I cannot say that about the theatre. The matter is settled now, and for all time. I cannot do this thing in the name of the Lord Jesus, nor can I give God thanks for it, therefore, I see that it would be wrong for me to continue any longer to attend the theatre."

This is an illustration of the application of the principle laid down by the Apostle in Colossians 3:17. The application of this principle to all of our pleasures

will solve the problem as to their being right or wrong. "For to me to live is Christ"—this is the motto of the Christian. "What would Jesus have me do?" is the test which should constantly be applied to all the Christian's pleasures and amusements. "He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also to walk, even as he walked."

These Fundamental Principles Applied by Way of Illustration to the Theater, the Dance, the Card Party.

Why single out these three amusements? Are there not other things just as bad as these? Yes, it is granted that there are, but the reason these three are chosen is because they are the precise forms of amusement presented whenever the question as to the right or wrong of amusements comes up for discussion. They are consequently forced upon us as test amusements.

It shall be our purpose here to examine in a general way each of these three popular forms of amusement, set them forth in their true light, and then allow the Christian to apply the five fundamental principles just enunciated to them.

THE THEATRE.

What kind of institution is the theatre? It has been with us for over 2,500 years, what has been its history? The question we are here considering is not what the theatre should be, nor will be, nor what, under certain conditions and limitations it might be, but what it is to-day as we see it. Nor is the theatre to be judged by exceptional plays, but as an institution as a whole. We are not here considering the theatre from the ethical, aesthetic, or even the intellectual, but from the Christian standpoint, its moral and spiritual effect upon the life. Nor is our purpose here to condemn, but to set

forth the nature of the theatre and let the reader judge as to what is right or wrong in the premises.

We are not left in doubt or darkness as to what has been the effect of the theatre upon the ethical and moral standards of all time during its existence. The testimony of the bygone centuries is abundant. Roman and Greek writers, like Plato, Plutarch, Socrates, Seneca, all alike claim that the theatre as an institution is antagonistic to morals. The theatre was suppressed in Athens; the Romans attributed their decay to it. Says Macaulay, in speaking of the theatre in England, "From the time the theatres were opened they became the seminaries of vice." Sir Walter Scott said that the theatre "was abandoned to the vicious; the best parts of the house being set apart for the abandoned characters."

Governments have been compelled to take action against the theatre in order to maintain the moral integrity of their people. Theatres have been detrimental to good government. The American Congress once adopted the following preamble: "Whereas true religion and good morals are the only solid foundation of public liberty and happiness: Resolved, That it be, and is hereby earnestly recommended to the several States to take the most efficient means for the encouragement thereof, and the suppression of theatrical entertainments, horseracing, gaming, and such other diversions as are productive of idleness, dissipation, and a general depravity of the principles and manners." Says Herriek Johnson: "History is all one way in testifying to the worthlessness of the stage as a school of virtue, or a means of rational and elevating amusement."

If this is the testimony of history, what about the theatre, as we see it today?

In the first place, it is built upon a wrong basis. It exists for money-making only. It has no other apology

or reason for its existence. We recognize that money-making in itself is not wrong, and that there are other institutions that are in business for money. The theatre claims to give value received in the amusement it provides for the money paid by its patrons. Well and good so far. But there is a difference between the theatre and business in this respect, which we must not fail to recognize. Business must conform to the laws of morality governing the commercial world or go out of business. No man can conduct a "white slave" traffic, for example, and expect protection from the government, even though it is conducted to make money and offers value received for the money paid. The theatre, as an institution, caters to the immoral in life in order to make money, and that is seriously wrong.

That the theatre cannot be supported by moral plays is the testimony of managers themselves, who excuse the wrong by saying that the public demand it. I do not believe that there is a theatre in the world today that can be supported and sustained or put on a paying basis except by the introduction of immoral plays. A strictly moral play is scarcely ever put upon the stage by the management. How do we know? Because when it is every minister in the city will receive an invitation to witness the play. "Way Down in New England" illustrates this point. Rabbi Wise, as reported by the *New York Tribune*, said recently:

"The stage ought to be an uplifting agency. It is far from it. It makes for degradation, for absolute moral rottenness. I wish to God our skirts were clean, and that there were fewer Jews to blame. The managers seem to vie with one another in producing the most degrading things, and they insult us by implying that we want such stuff, and that you and I don't want to see a clean play.

—

"I indict the theatres as they are today. I don't care if every manager is a Jew—they are all heathens. I indict those who are pandering to vice, whether Jew or Christian. It is the debasement of the nation. And it will remain so until you say, 'We will not go near your theatres.' Is not our moral life insulted by what we see on the stage today? . . .

"There is one thing to be done. We've got to increase our moral assets. There is too much of penal law and too little of moral law. I want the moral principle applied. We honor not honor but success. We have but little honor for the man who is not rich. We've got to change our moral judgment of men. You can't prevent a man from buying an automobile or a dukelet for his daughter, but we can limit our respect for him, even for a man who has libraries to give away. We can limit the purchasing power of money."

"Archbishop Farley is reported to have declared that the stage is worse today than it was in the days of paganism, and the *New York Evening Post*, looking at the theatre as it is in this city, thinks that there is much ground for this sweeping assertion. It goes on in this strain:

"'Not only is "Salome," against which there were such strong protests two years ago, being produced regularly, but there are at least four plays in hitherto reputable theatres so indecent or dealing with such disgusting themes that they would not have been tolerated a few years ago. For this situation, the avarice of the managers, Christian and Jewish, is not wholly to be taxed. The laxity of the press is not without its share of the blame. How to remedy the situation is a problem to which the city's spiritual advisers may well devote themselves. * * * * *

But, if the present rage for nudity and the portrayal of lives of immorality continues, we shall soon reach a

pass where it will be folly to assert that we have any standards at all, or to require any of the theatre.' "

In the *Grand Magazine* one who signs herself "An Actress" frankly confesses that it is next to impossible for a woman to attain success on the stage without paying a heavy price, "promotion, more often than not, being at the cost of all a true woman holds most dear."

The theatre presents its patrons with wrong views of life. Its plays are based on and portray the infelicitities and unfaithfulness of married life, escapades and clandestine marriages are made to seem heroic, domestic tragedy is laughed at, and religion is ridiculed. Its characters are unreal, its teachings are pervertive, its morals are subvertive. Moral license and liberty seem to be awarded, consequently the patrons of the play come away with those ideas, some, yea, many, to put them into practice.

Said M. Dumas, who wrote plays for the theatre, in a letter to a friend: "You do not take your daughter to see my play. You are right. Let me say, once for all, that you must not take your daughter to the theatre. It is not merely the work that is immoral, it is the place." Macready, the great actor, left this testimony: "None of my children shall ever, with my consent, or on any pretense, enter a theatre, or have any visiting connection with actors or actresses." Edwin Booth, the noted actor, said: "I never permit my wife and daughter to witness a play without previously ascertaining its character." A great many parents might learn a lesson of great benefit from this testimony.

Can any intelligent, sincere Christian, after listening to such testimony as this, ever again ask whether the theatre is a fit place for a follower of the holy and pure Christ to be found?

Moral character is not a condition for entrance upon the stage. There is no profession in existence today

where morals count for so little as on the stage. The most glaring and gross immoralities as committed by actors and actresses, as reported from time to time in the newspapers, are no barrier to the stage.

But, do not impure men get into the pulpit sometimes? we are asked. Certainly. But they are the exception and not the rule, and as soon as they are found out they are put out. Their fate is then sealed. The only resort for them is the stage, from which no one is barred on the ground of immorality.

Would you allow your son or daughter to associate with, to be courted by, to become engaged to or marry an actress or actor? No. Why?

In view of all this,

*
WHAT ATTITUDE SHOULD THE CHRISTIAN ASSUME
TOWARDS THE THEATRE?

If it be true, as the managers assert, and it seems to be true, that the public is responsible for the immoral condition of the stage; that the managers give what the public demands—if this be true, and the Christian attending the theatre is counted as part of that immoral public, then the Christian ought to quit the theatre at once. He is in duty bound not to lend the name of the Christ to an institution that is confessedly filthy. Again, if, as we are told so often, the theatre puts all its patrons on one common ground, that it is a great leveler, and thus throws the pure and the impure together in a common ancestry; then the Christian has nothing to do but to quit at once and forever. If it is admitted, as it must be, that the desire of the professing Christian for entertainment and amusement is to be satisfied in the same way and with the same kind of a show that satisfies the lowest and the vilest who crowd the galleries—if there is to be the same food for all, no matter what seats in the theatre they occupy—

then it is high time that our Christian sensibilities be shamefully shocked, and that we vow before God never to be seen inside a theatre again. If the men and women who act upon the stage, and before whom we sit and listen, are not fit to be companions of our sons and daughters, then the Christian must be done with the theatre.

There is no use trying to reform the theatre. Garrick, Macready, Booth, Irving tried it, and signally failed; the church of the middle ages tried it, and it ruined the church. Where shall the reform begin? From the inside? That has been tried as we have seen, and has proved to be a failure. From the outside? How can that be when the managers say that the outside public is responsible for the immorality of the theatre by demanding immoral plays. Not reformation, but abolition is the remedy.

"But," some one asks, "can we not remedy these things by patronizing only good plays? Supposing the managers should put on the stage one good moral play a week, would it not be all right then to attend the theatre on that night?" No. Am I, as a Christian, asked to give my support to an institution that is confessedly immoral six nights out of seven? No, the Christian must make better use of his money than that; he must spend his energies in a nobler cause. The Christian is to try to save the world, not to try to make a bad institution a paying investment to its managers.

"If we do not let our children go to the theatre, they will go to worse places," says some half-hearted believer. We reply: "Where will you find worse places?"

From what has been said it really seems that the only position that the Christian can take, after applying the five fundamental principles which are to regulate his amusements, is one of self-denial so long as present conditions exist, yea, and forever for that matter. The

Christian will suffer no aesthetic or intellectual loss. Staging, with its tinsel and nudity, is not necessary to the understanding of Shakespeare; oftentimes staging weakens the play. The oratorios are far superior to the operas so far as interpretation goes.

Let us then apply the Christian principles to the theatre and the play, and take a definite, conscientious, Christian stand on the whole matter.

THE DANCE.

In discussing the question of the dance we must remember that we are considering the dance not as it ought to be, nor as it might be under certain restricted conditions, but as it really is as seen in everyday life. Nor do we distinguish here between the various forms of dancing, such, for example, as the round and the square dance. We are here dealing with the dance as we see it today in our midst—as a social institution, the dance as it holds forth in society.

Let us apply to this modern institution the fundamental Christian principles enunciated in this chapter in order that we may determine whether it is an institution such as a Christian may patronize without injury to his own conscience or life, and without thereby becoming a stumbling-block to others.

How does the dance measure up to the principle regarding recreation? Does the modern dance build up the physical organism, and recreate lost tissue? Let us see. A man may work hard nine hours a day for six days in the week, and, after each night's rest, arise refreshed for the duties of the day. But let him spend one evening at the ball or dance, and he is totally unfitted for the labors on the following day. The dance violates every known law of health. Statistics show that women who dance to excess do not live to be over twenty-five

years of age; men, not over thirty-one. The medical profession is unanimous in its testimony against the dance as a health destroyer. The late hours, the impure atmosphere, the breathing by each other of foul and fetid breath, the lack of sufficient clothing, the overheated rooms, the exposure by going out when the body is overheated and improperly clad for protection—all these militate against good health; this is dissipation, not recreation. Whatever sends a man to labor with bloodshot eyes, bloated, stupid, yawning and utterly fagged out, is not to be counted on to build up the health of the body. Anyway the modern dance was not introduced for the purpose of promoting hygiene.

The modern dance is most certainly not conducive to morality. Its dress, its pose, the close mingling of the sexes, can by no means be interpreted as ministering to the morality of its devotees. It is claimed by some that the sex is the basis of the dance—rule out the sex idea and you have no dance. Why does a man seldom desire to dance with his wife, or a brother with his sister? The privileges allowed and taken in the ball-room would not be allowed for an instant outside of it without serious consequences following.

Abandoned women are known to be the best dancers. In a canvass made in one or two refuges for fallen women the following facts were revealed: of the 200 fallen women who were inmates of these homes, 163 had fallen through the dance, 20 through drink, 10 through free choice, 7 through poverty. It is estimated that there are 500,000 fallen women in the United States, and seven-tenths of them fell through the dance. Listen to that, fathers and mothers, who allow your daughters to frequent the dance! The following extract from a Chicago daily newspaper is of interest in this connection. Prof. R. G. Huntinghouse, of the Dancing Masters' Association, said: "Young people, who

form the greater portion of our dancing classes, . . . object to walking round the room or bowing here and there. They consider it so much time wasted. What they favor is the dance with the 'closed' position such as waltzing and the like offer. The position which we know as 'open' never gains much popularity with the young people." Think of these words, Christian people! Will you, knowing such things, allow your children to visit such places? A chief of police of New York city is reported to have said that three-fourths of the fallen women in that city fell through the dance. A Roman Catholic bishop of that city said that of all the fallen women that had confessed the same in the confessional, nine-tenths had fallen through the dance. And yet, in spite of these amazing facts we still find Christians asking the question, Is it right for a Christian to dance? Of course it is not. Some one has said: "An active Christian will have no time to dance; a sensible Christian will find something better to do; a loving Christian will feel that he cannot dance; a spiritually-minded Christian will have no time to dance. If there be any other kind of Christians in the church they had better be out of it than in it and so their opinion as to what Christians ought to do is of no value."

Now let the Christian pause here, and spend a few moments in applying the five fundamental Christian principles to this form of amusement. He will soon settle the question once and for all.

THE CARD TABLE.

We are here dealing with the card table as an institution. The question here discussed does not involve the right or wrong of one card or pack of cards decorated in one way, and another in a different way.

Nor are we to be understood as saying that the mere playing of a game of cards is a sin in itself considered. Certainly we do not intend to convey the idea that every man and woman who plays cards is bad; nor even that such card-players are not even Christians. Of course, a man can sin in playing a game of cards just as he can sin in doing anything else.

The card table is such a great factor in the social life of the day that the church cannot very well close her eyes to it. Three-quarters of a million packs of euchre playing cards are issued annually. It is claimed that, outside of the race-track, nine-tenths of the gambling is done at the card-table. Society holds from two to five card parties weekly. From estimates gathered for one year recently the following facts regarding the card table are astounding: As a result of card-playing 128 persons were shot or stabbed; 6 attempted, and 24 committed suicide; 60 others were murdered in cold blood, 68 were ruined financially, 2 went insane, 43 committed forgery and embezzlement, 32 bank cashiers absconded with trust funds, three millions of dollars were embezzled for gambling purposes. "If," says a writer, "we could understand the ruin, penetrate the mysteries, reckon up the ruined lives, blighted homes, blasted characters which some well-meaning (Christian?) people have been responsible for in the fact that they have encouraged the game of cards, we should not need to plead for its abolition." From all this it is clear that there is a tremendous issue at stake in dealing with the social function known as the card table.

We shall hardly be accused of unfairness if in our indictment of the card table we claim that it is, to say the least, a *questionable* amusement for the Christian.

It has the "appearance of evil" certainly. It has always been looked upon with some degree of suspicion. Whether we like it or not men have always associated cards with gambling. The logic that leads men to argue thus may not be very sound, but it is undeniable.

The card table stands indicted as a waste of good time for the Christian.

By reason of the demands of society it is impossible to look upon cards any longer as amusements or pastime. Card-playing has become a perfect craze—one which holds men and women helpless in its grasp. Society demands too much time for this game. Can any conscientious Christian imagine that he can give a satisfactory answer to God for the use of his time when he has spent from two to three nights of each week around the card-table?

Are all card-players dishonest? Do they all cheat? We would not say so; it cannot be denied, however, that the tendency of the game is to promote just such vices. The sly nod, the suggestive wink, the knowing look—these things may be rightly called cheating. Look at the jealousies, the envy, the alienations card-playing leads to. It is for this reason that card-playing has been banished in the United States Navy. Because it leads to strife, envy, and brawls, infidel owners of lumber-camps in the northwest have forbidden the playing of cards in the camps. Because of the bad results from card-playing the state of Texas arrests anyone found playing cards on its trains.

That card-playing leads to gambling there can be no question. Statistics show that eight-tenths of gamblers arrested learned to play cards at home. Much of the card-playing today is gambling. Whenever there is a prize offered for the game, there is gambling. Here is the law of the state of Illinois on the subject:

Whoever shall play for money or any other valuable thing, at any game with cards, dice, or checks, or valuables, or any other article, instrument, or thing whatsoever which may be used for the purpose of playing or betting upon or winning, or losing money, or any other thing or article of value, or shall bet upon any game others may be playing, shall be fined not exceeding one hundred dollars, and not less than ten.

Did you ever ask the man of the world what he thinks of card-playing? Did you ever ask the gambler what he thinks about the game? Said the wife of a converted gambler recently, after depicting the sorrow that had come into her life through gambling: "You may depend upon it there are no cards in our home now." Only the other day a professional gambler, who makes no pretensions of Christianity, told a friend that he never would allow his children to touch a card, indeed he would not allow a card in his home.

In the face of such testimony as this what should be the attitude of the Christian towards this game? There can be no question but that it is a waste of the Lord's time, time that should be used in His service; that it unfits one for prayer and the reading of the Word of God, as well as for soul-winning; that it is a very bad example to set before the rising generation, indeed, before anyone, especially those who make no profession of Christianity. It should, therefore, be unlawful to the Christian.

Do not allow cards in your home. A game that is so dangerous is not safe in your home, nor for your children. Often we hear parents say: "Well, I had better allow my children to play cards at home than to have them go away from home and play them." Do you argue that way with reference to drink? Do you give your children liquor at home lest they should go to the saloon and get drunk? Really speaking, card-

playing leads away from home, for it creates in our children such a desire for games of chance that the wholesome, innocent games of the home cannot satisfy.

Now, Christian friend, what shall be your position with reference to this modern curse—the card table, more prevalent, we sometimes think, than the family altar? Will you apply the five fundamental principles which should govern the Christian in all his amusements, to this game, and abide by the results? God grant that you may.

THE CHRISTIAN IN
BUSINESS

CHAPTER III.

THE CHRISTIAN IN BUSINESS.

RELIGION and business are not to be divorced. There need be no conflict between the ledger and the Bible, the church and the counting-house, Christianity and commerce. Plato and Aristotle were so opposed to commerce that they declared it to be the curse of the nations, and advised that cities be built ten miles from the sea-coast. No such antagonism need exist between Christianity and commerce. Jesus Christ made a religion of His business just as He made a business of His religion. The Apostle Paul found nothing incompatible with his profession of Christianity and his allegiance to Christ in the fact that while preaching the Gospel he followed his trade as a tent-maker. With Jesus and Paul business and religion went together, and never seemed to quarrel.

WHAT IS MEANT BY BUSINESS?

The word *business* is used here in its largest sense, and includes what is popularly known as commerce, trade, or traffic, whether between nations or individuals. It comprises all those transactions recognized in the buying, selling, and interchange of goods, commodities, merchandise, or property. It has to do with the whole transaction popularly known as trading, buying and selling, whether at wholesale or retail, or to nations or private individuals. For convenience the industrial classes have sometimes been divided into three groups: producers, manufacturers, traders. Producers, like

farmers and miners; manufacturers, such as those who turn corn into food, and wool and flax into apparel; traders, such as make profit out of the transfer and exchange of all that which is produced and manufactured. A business man may belong to any one or all of these classes, and not one is independent of the others. You can readily see then that by business is here included the whole of a commercial transaction from the beginning to the end.

A CHRISTIAN, WHAT?

By a Christian is meant not merely a man who takes the name of Christ upon his lips, thereby professing to be a follower and a disciple of Christ, but one who by a definite act of committal and trust has taken Jesus Christ to be not only his Saviour from the guilt and power of sin, but has also chosen Him to be the King of his life, the One to whom every action shall be submitted for approval. It is to this kind of a man that the appeal of this chapter is made; to any other man the principles here laid down may be considered not only impossible, but absolutely impracticable, if not positively absurd. The emphasis here is on the word "Christian." This is vital to the understanding of the discussion here set forth. We are here speaking to the *Christian* business man.

And let us not forget that we are speaking of the Christian man in certain relations—in the business world, not on his knees, but on the street; not in his closet, but in his office; not in private, but in public; not proclaiming the Gospel, but offering goods for sale; dealing not with God, but with man; bending not over the altar, but over the bench; not with his Bible, but with his ledger; not with his Saviour, but with his neighbor. What we here behold is a man "fervent in business . . . serving the Lord" by fair, honest and Christian-like business dealings.

That there are men who are thoroughly Christian in all their business life we need not for one moment doubt. Some people may question the truth of such a claim. But unless we are willing to believe that every man in business is a fraud, a cheat, and a rogue—the which we are hardly ready to do I feel sure—we must admit the truth of our claim. We admit that every business man is not a saint, but we are by no means willing to admit that every business man is a scamp. Business is by no means to be considered a necessary evil for the Christian, but a sacred calling in which the creature may glorify his Creator.

A CHRISTIAN IN BUSINESS, WHAT?

To be a Christian in business does not mean that a man is to be talking religion to his customers all the time, nor that he should deliver a Gospel message with every sale, nor put a tract in every parcel, nor even a Gospel stamp on every letter he sends out. Not that these things are wrong; by no means. If judiciously used much good may result, indeed has resulted, from this kind of Christian effort and activity. It should not be overlooked, however, that serious harm has often come from this kind of testimony. Especially has this been the case when the person giving the testimony has contradicted it by not living up to his Christian profession. To be a Christian in business means, first and foremost, that a man shall be known as a man of truth, sincerity, uprightness, and integrity. With this back of him his ministrations for the advancement of Christ's kingdom will be corroborative of his profession; without such a character such efforts will bring but ridicule on religion. Nor must there be the slightest ground for believing that the Christian man in business is religious simply for gain, thus making gain out of godliness.

This is fatal to any influence for good, and brings religion and its professors into ill-repute. Godliness is gain, but it is not to be used *for* gain.

WHAT LIGHT DOES THE SCRIPTURE THROW UPON
THIS THEME?

It is to be reasonably expected that the Bible will have something to say concerning the conduct of the Christian in a sphere of life so large and so all-embracing as the realm of commerce. Nor are we disappointed in this regard. Here, again, as in the preceding chapter, the Bible seeks to control the outward actions of the Christian by inward principles—principles, mark you, not rules.

THE BIBLE RECOGNIZES BUSINESS AS A NECESSITY OF
HUMAN LIFE.

Paul, in 1 Corinthians 7:29-31, and Ephesians 4:28 clearly tells us that business is a necessity for us while in this probation period of our lives. Listen to his words: "The time is short; it remaineth that those that buy (be) as though they possessed not; and they that use this world, as not abusing it." "Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." Says Paul, again, in Titus 3:14: "And let our people too learn to set a good example in following honest occupations for the supply of their necessities, so that they may not live useless lives." (Weymouth's translation.)

God has put man under the necessity of work as well as worship; both are necessary. A man need not neglect his business to take care of his soul. In the mind of God there is no antagonism between work and worship. The doing of either should not be injurious to the other. A man can be successful in trade, wise

in investments, and yet lay up treasure in heaven. This we see to be the clear teaching of 1 Timothy 6:17-19: "Charge them that are rich in this world . . . that they do good, that they be rich in good works . . . laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, and that they may lay hold on eternal life."

No Christian man is to be a loafer, a parasite. Paul makes his boast in the first letter to the Thessalonians, using these words (Weymouth's translation): "Nor did we eat anyone's bread without paying for it, but we labored and toiled, working hard night and day in order not to be a burden to any of you, And this we did in order to set you an example, that you might imitate us. For when we were with you we laid down this rule for you: That is, if a man does not choose to work, neither shall he eat" (3:7-10). It is the duty of every man to work and thus contribute his share to the interests of the commonwealth. "Let him that stole, steal no more, but rather let him work"; that is the Apostle's way of stating the necessity of work. The man who is able to work and does not, but instead loafs and lives on the good nature and beneficence of others is a thief. A man must work for his living, not steal it. This world owes no man a living. All it owes him is the opportunity to work for his sustenance. And for that God has made ample provision. If there is need and poverty anywhere it is not God's fault; it is the fault or the crime of man. There is then something seriously wrong, not with the provision, which is of God, for that is abundant and ample, but with the distribution, which is of man, and which by reason of his great selfishness is too often confined in too close quarters. I am to buy what I need from the man who has what I need with the money that my labor has brought to me. I am not to expect anything for noth-

ing, saving as it is a gift. Buying and selling and exchanging the products of the earth and the commodities of life is the divine way of meeting the matter of supply and demand.

Of course the Christian man recognizes the fact that business is but a means to an end, and not that end in itself. Paul was a tent-maker by trade, but a Christian by profession and calling. He used his trade simply in order that he might fulfil his calling. I heard the other day of some good Christian gentleman who had opened an establishment simply for the purpose of giving employment to worthy men who were not able to secure it elsewhere. That was a splendidly Christian thing to do, and a fine illustration of conducting business as a means to an end, and not as an end in itself. In the same way the Christian man ought to conduct his business for Christ—as a means to an end, that end being the service of the Master.

THE SPHERE OF BUSINESS CIRCUMSCRIBED.

The first principle laid down in the Word of God with regard to the conduct of business is clearly taught in Colossians 3:17: "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by Him." This means that any form of business which does not meet with Christ's approval and which can not be conducted with a view to the interests of God's kingdom is a business in which the Christian cannot participate. Some forms of business are by the principles of this verse excluded from the legitimate list. Romans 12:11 tells us that the business in which we are to engage is one in which we may "serve the Lord." The sphere or circle of the Christian's commercial activities is therefore, more limited and circumscribed than that of the man of the world. This principle, I feel sure, excludes the

Christian's participation in any business that destroys the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual well-being of man. Whatever pulls down rather than builds up, destroys rather than preserves, dissipates rather than recreates is a traffic with which the Christian must have nothing to do. A Christian saloon-keeper, for example, is a clear contradiction. There can be no such thing. Is the druggist who sells cocaine, or any other narcotic drug, saving as a prescribed medicine and at the order of the physician, entitled to the name Christian? Are the men who rent their buildings knowingly for the sale of liquor, and other kindred evils that destroy men physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually, to be considered for a moment as Christian men? And I have wondered sometimes whether the government or the nation that allows, licenses, and protects those who engage in a business that does so ruin men has one iota of right to call itself Christian. Whatever ruins men, body, soul, and spirit, can never, by any right under God's heaven, be entitled to the high and noble name of Christian. It is evident, then, that the principles laid down for us in these Scripture passages will determine the nature and kind of business in which a follower of Jesus Christ, who loved men and gave Himself for them, and a lover of the souls of men, as Christ was, may legitimately engage.

THE NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN'S BUSINESS CONDITIONED.

There are two texts which we may profitably consider in this connection, and which contain principles which limit the nature of any business or trade in which the Christian may engage. Colossians 3:2, "Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth;" 1 Corinthians 7:29-31, "But this I say, brethren, the time is short; it remaineth, that both they . . . that

buy (be) as though they possessed not; and they that use this world, as not abusing it; for the fashion of this world passeth away." We are here taught that the inward impulse and the governing disposition of the Christian in all life's activities should be the result of heavenly-mindedness; the putting of the spirit of heaven and the eternal upon and into all that which is the material and therefore temporal. The Christian must not only *seek* heaven, he must *think* heaven in all his commercial activities. The balances and weights and measurements of the sanctuary must be upon all that he does. He must hold things for God with the perpetual conviction that they will not last; to have the world, and not let the world have him; to be the world's master and not its slave; to be superior to its perishing greatness, its fading beauties, and its impotent antagonism, and thereby prove his redemption from its power. Christian, let not your business be like the skin on your hand which will not easily come off, but like the glove on your hand, or the hat on your head that you can easily take off and part with.

We should "use the world and not abuse it." To "abuse" means to consume by using, or to overuse, and so abuse. When a man allows his business to completely absorb his time and condition his experience as though he were a creature made for this life only; when he fails to put the impress of the eternal upon that which is temporal; when he allows the present to overshadow and even hide the future, thereby forgetting that as a Christian he is called to immortality and eternal life; when he buys merely to possess, and hoards for the mere sake of hoarding; when he fails to "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," then he is violating a fundamental Christian principle that should control Christ's man in business.

Does all this mean that a Christian man has no right to accumulate riches or to create wealth? In answer, may we say that it is not within the province of man to *create* wealth. Man may amass or accumulate wealth, but he cannot create it. God alone can do that. It is legitimate for a Christian man to accumulate wealth, but he must be as one who holds and yet does not possess. He is to recognize that he is simply a steward of God; that his funds are trust funds; that he is not at liberty to do with them as he chooses. He must use and not abuse, ever remembering that as a steward of God's bounties he is to be called upon to give an account of his stewardship.

CHRISTIANITY CONDITIONS THE PURPOSE AND EXTENT OF THE CHRISTIAN MAN'S BUSINESS LIFE.

It tells him that the main purpose of life is not to accumulate wealth. "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth" are the striking words of Jesus. By this He meant to say that a man's chief end in life is not to amass money. Business is a means to an end, and not the end itself.

Yet a man is not forbidden by the principles of Christianity from making money; nor even from becoming rich. Many Christian men have made much money; many Christian men are rich. The Bible does not anywhere stigmatize riches in themselves. It is not money but the *love* of money that is the root of all evil. It is a dangerous thing but not a sinful thing to be wealthy. The soul of the rich is pierced through with many sorrows from which the poor are spared. Thank God that you have no big bank account, for thereby you are saved many great and sore temptations and snares.

Two reasons why men should make money are set forth in Ephesians 4:28, which reads: "Let him that

stole steal no more: but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." Here is one great principle: a Christian man should labor and make money in order that he may give it away to the man or cause that may be in need. The next thing to be noted is found in 1 Timothy 5:8: "But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." A somewhat freer translation of this verse reads as follows: "But if a man makes no provision for those dependent upon him, and especially for those of his own family, he has disowned the faith and is worse than an unbeliever."

Two great principles may be deduced from these Scripture passages: first, that a man must engage in business in order to provide a living for himself and family, that is, for those who are rightfully dependent upon him; secondly, he must work more that he may make more money in order to have somewhat to distribute to those who are in need, and indeed to the cause of Christianity in general.

One need hardly dwell upon the first of these two principles. That a man ought to provide for his own we will scarcely doubt. It may not be out of place, however, to say in this connection, that any man who is able to care for his own and leaves them to be a care upon the generosity of others, or subjects of charity, or who lives in luxury while his own relatives may be in need of the very necessities of life—that man has no right to call himself a Christian; he is worse than an infidel; he has denied the very faith which he professes to believe.

The second of these two principles, however, may need to be dwelt upon. It will be remembered that Jesus, on one occasion said: "A man's life consisteth

not in the abundance of the things which he posseth." By this He meant that a man's existence does not consist in the superfluity, the overabundance, that which remains over and above that which is necessary for his living; in other words, a man's bank account is not that by which he lives. That which is necessary for his life is that which it takes him to pay for his food, clothing, rent, and the other necessities of life. What is put in the bank is over and above his need for living, but is put away for the future, for a rainy day. And it is just this "superabundance" that causes man most of his trouble.

Now the question arises, Why does God allow a man to make more money than he really needs for the supply of his own needs and those of his own family? Is it that he may save a little for the time when he shall not be able to work any more, or for use in some day of disaster? Various answers may be given to this question. There can be no doubt, however, that it is God's will that what a man earns over and above that which is necessary for his sustenance is to be used for benevolence, in the interests of the man who would but cannot work, for the helping of the widow and the orphan, to relieve the sick, the afflicted, the oppressed, for the support and extension of the Gospel, and for the work of the church at home and abroad.

Take as a good illustration of this thought the parable of the Unjust Steward, or at least a part of that parable (Luke 16). The steward of the parable was accused by some one to his master that he had wasted or was wasting the goods which had been committed to him by his employer. An accounting was at once demanded. The steward, knowing that he was guilty, and feeling sure that he would be relieved of his position, began at once to consider what he would

do when put out of the stewardship. He did not feel that he had strength enough to engage in manual labor, and to beg he was ashamed. What should he do? After much thought this plan suggested itself to him: "I will call my master's debtors and by cancelling part of their indebtedness and giving them a receipt in full just as though they had paid the full amount, I will put them under obligation to me, so that when I lose my position I shall find refuge with them." This policy the shrewd steward put into execution, and evidently it worked just as he thought it would. He lost his position, but found a welcome into the home of those friends whose favor he had bought with his master's money.

Our Saviour draws a very forceful lesson from this parable. However dishonest this steward might have been, he was at least shrewd and prudent, and his prudence was manifested in using present things to provide for a future home and happiness. In this he is to be an example to Christians, to children of the light, who oftentimes do not act so sagaciously as this son of the world did. Jesus says: "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." What do these words of the Master mean? Just this: Use the money and the means which God has given you to make friends with, so that when you die, those who have been won to Christ by your means will be at the gates of the mansions above to bid you welcome into those everlasting habitations.

The Christian man, who, with means, has supported the missionary, furthered the spread of the Gospel, aided in the rescuing of the fallen, brought lost men to a knowledge of Jesus Christ, fed the hungry, clothed the naked, cared for the sick, provided for the widow and the orphan, established hospitals, saved souls, in

short who has used his money in any one or many of these ways, as a steward of the living Christ and for the purpose of making friends, will at last find himself surrounded by a multitude who through his generosity have found the Lord Jesus Christ as their Saviour, and heaven as their home. What a glad welcome that will be at the golden gate! What an awful thing it will be for the man who has lived selfishly and for himself alone, who has "wasted" his goods in that he has not used them for their intended purpose, namely, to "make friends" for Christ, to find himself at last, not only shut out of those heavenly mansions, but also friendless and lost in the other world.

May it not be that the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, which immediately follows the parable of the Unjust Steward, was intended to teach just this awful truth of friendlessness in the other world? Here is the story of a rich man who spent all his money on himself and his family, and had not a crumb to give to the poor and the needy. What an opportunity he had of making a friend of that poor beggar who was laid at his gate daily, expecting to be fed with even the crumbs which might be thrown out from that mansion! The rich man, however, did not grasp the opportunity. The result of his refusing to "make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness" is clearly and sadly seen in the concluding part of the narrative. The rich man, having failed of entering the heavenly mansions, awakes in the other world to find himself in hell, and in torments. Listen to his pitiful pleading! For what? For a friend. He would have given all he once possessed, if he could now do so, for just one friend who would relieve his misery. But no, there was no friend to welcome him into the everlasting habitations. What a story on stewardship and the proper use of money!

A man may be damned for his wrong use of money as for any other sin. Covetousness is idolatry, and idolatry is throughout the Bible recognized as a sin that shuts the door of heaven in a man's face. It would be an interesting study to go through the Gospels and contemplate Christ's teaching on the use and abuse of wealth. Let us take just one illustration for example. Let it be what is known as the parable of the Rich Fool, found in Luke 12:15-21: "And he (Jesus) said unto them (His disciples), Take heed, and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." Now let us look at this picture for a moment. What is there for which you can condemn this rich man? Why should he be called the rich *fool*? Is there not much of practical wisdom in his actions? To have prosperity smile upon your diligence is certainly not wrong. Here is an illustration of the truth of the Scriptural statement, "The hand of the diligent maketh rich." To consider what to do with the increase of wealth can certainly not be counted as a sin; indeed, it is counted a mark of wisdom to consider how wisely to invest that which has been committed to us. This man's folly which was held up by the Master as being an example of consummate foolishness consisted not in the amassing or even in the possessing of wealth, but in the manner of disposing of it. This man gained simply to possess; instead of using the world, he abused it. He held his possessions with a tight grip instead of with a loose hand. Wealth was his master instead of his slave. He used his goods to minister to himself and his own selfish ends rather than as a trust from God. He bought and possessed: he used the world and abused it.

There is an important passage of Scripture we should consider in this connection. Paul treats of

the matter of wealth, in his first letter to Timothy 6:17-19. Weymouth translates this passage somewhat freely, as follows: "Impress on those who are rich in the present age that they must not be haughty nor set their hope on riches—that unstable foundation—but on God who provides us richly with all things for our enjoyment. They must be beneficent, rich in noble deeds, open-handed and liberal; storing up for themselves that which shall be a solid foundation for the future, that they may lay hold of the life which is life indeed." Herein we have a splendid and an inspired illustration of the point we have just been seeking to emphasize: that a man should engage in business not simply that he may supply his own needs and the necessities of those dependent upon him, but also that he may make money which shall be used for beneficence, philanthropy, and for the extension of the kingdom of God in the hearts of men the world over.

Here are some scriptures which it would be well for every professed follower of Christ to read and to ponder, not once or twice, but constantly. They may set before us in clearer light than any mere words of man what we should do with our "surplus," our "abundance," our bank account, in none of which our life really "consists": Luke 3:11; 1 John 3:16-18; James 2:14-19; 5:4-6.

THE SPIRIT IN WHICH THE CHRISTIAN OUGHT TO CONDUCT HIS BUSINESS.

Our Lord himself described the spirit in which Christian commerce should be conducted when He said: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"; and "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them."

Love is to characterize all our dealings in business. "What," says someone, "love in business? Impos-

sible! No business could be run on such a principle." If that be true, then we had better quit business, for it is better to do that than to lose our souls. "For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" If you are a real Christian, love will control all your business dealings. What you cannot do as a Christian, you have no right to do at all. What is wrong in the one instance, is most certainly wrong in the other. Yet how often we hear business men say: "I can't do this as a Christian; this is a matter of business; religion and business must not be mixed." Have we not a right to ask just what a man means by such a statement? When the business man stands before the judgment bar of God which part of him will be presented there, the business or the religious part? Will God make any such distinction? Can we, if we really think the matter over carefully and in the spirit of Christ argue so? Has God one set of commandments for the business man, and another set for the Christian? Is there one set of beatitudes for the home and the church, and another and different set for business? It is admitted that men do have one set of rules for religion and another set for business. But, does that make the thing right? We affirm emphatically that *it does not*. You may ask: "Would you act differently?" I do not know. I might. No man knows what he will do until he is tempted. I might go with the multitude as many others have done. I am as likely to break down as others. But that does not make wrong right, nor the instruction here given less important and true.

SPEAKING THE TRUTH IN ALL OUR TRANSACTIONS.

"Lie not," says the Apostle, "for we are members one of another." Truthfulness is fundamental to integrity and confidence among individuals, in society,

and business. A lie seriously disturbs existing conditions and affects the whole body, politic and commercial; it destroys the confidence on which our civilization rests. No man, much less a Christian, can afford to lie. But some one will say: "You cannot conduct business without lying in some degree." We answer it may not be absolutely necessary either to conduct business or to live, so far as that is concerned; but it is absolutely necessary, if we are to have eternal life, to be truthful. "All liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." If we lie, we are the children of the devil, and not Christians, for the devil is a liar and the father of liars. We must be truthful at all costs.

The Christian man cannot afford to misrepresent his goods in order that he may increase his sales, or indicate to the public by scratched-out figures on the ticket that there has been a reduction in the price of the article, when in reality there has been no such change. No Christian man can afford to do anything like this, nor can he afford to work for any employer who either expects or compels him to employ falsehood in order to promote trade.

It takes a good deal of moral courage to tell the truth; but it takes very much more courage for a Christian to tell a lie right before God and the angel that is writing in the book of life; right under the sad reproving look of Him who came to bear witness of the truth. Stand for the truth, no matter what it costs, and you thereby help to extend the kingdom of God in the hearts of men.

Look out for these half-truths, or half-lies, or half-truth lies as they are sometimes called. They are the worst and the most dangerous of all kinds of lies. "Buy the truth and sell it not." Tell the truth under

all circumstances, at all risks, and great shall be your reward. "Don't debauch your conscience. Tell the truth about your goods, even though you should be told to leave the next instant. No man can afford to lie, cheat, or swindle and expect to have any decent self-respect for himself or expect any such from others. The business lie is just as bad as any other kind of lie. The commercial liar will be cast into hell with liars of every other kind and class. No distinctions will be made in the judgment: "All liars," says the Scriptures, "shall be damned."

"But," some say, "they all do it in business." That is a lie, they do not all do it. There are truthful business men in the world today; men whose word is as good as their bond; merchants whose word can be absolutely depended on; men who, as the Scriptures say: Swear to their own hurt, and change not. But even if it were true that they all do it, that "it is the custom of trade," and "the practice of business," is the Christian man to be governed in his business dealings by what are called "the habits of trade," and "the customs of business," or is he to be governed by the spirit of Jesus Christ? Is the supposed fact that "they all do it" to be considered sufficient justification for false dealing? No!

HONEST DEALINGS.

"Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men," should be the motto of the Christian business man. Honesty is closely allied to truthfulness, for the truthful man cannot be dishonest. There are so many opportunities in the business world for acts of dishonesty that a man has to call upon his Christian integrity all the time if he is to follow the Scriptural injunctions just quoted. Not man's estimate as to what is honest is to be the stand-

ard; we must provide things honest in the sight of God. The above quoted scriptures (Romans 12:17; 2 Corinthians 8:21), are really taken from Proverbs and may be translated: "Thou shalt devise, or plan, excellent things in the sight of God or man." The words "devise," and "provide" have reference to taking thought beforehand concerning a thing. From this thought then we derive the principle that a Christian man must make up his mind beforehand that to him at least business is to be conducted on the principle of honesty and strict integrity. The Christian man is not honest because "honesty is the best policy;" for such a man would just as quickly be dishonest if that policy were best and promised larger returns. The Christian man is honest because in the sight of God he cannot very well be anything else without forfeiting all rights to that sacred name.

When a mob of rioters were about to attack a flour-mill, Luther stood between it and them. "Master, we must live," they cried. "I don't see that: you 'must' be honest," answered the brave reformer. Never at any time must the Christian compromise his integrity. Says Confucius: "In our opportunities for enriching ourselves, we should never lose sight of honesty."

"Provide things honest in the sight of God and man." Here is a double standard: "In the sight of men"—this helps us to regard the opinions of others. Private interpretations of honesty are to be carefully watched. To be measuring ourselves by our own standard is not always safe. "In the sight of God"—in order that we may understand that oftentimes God requires more than do men, that we are to be held accountable for our motives, powers, intent, and opportunity. God's law demands the best; men will take less. God demands honesty and integrity as we know them in His sight and not merely as men may define them.

"Love worketh no ill to his neighbor ; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." The man who allows himself to be controlled in all his business dealings by this law of love will not only refrain from cheating, or, by driving a shrewd bargain, taking advantage of his neighbor, but also will not allow his neighbor to cheat himself. There is an interesting passage of inspired writ bearing very definitely upon this phase of our subject ; it is found in Exodus 23 :4, 5 : "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee, lying under his burden, . . . thou shalt surely help with him." If we see a man doing anything that will harm himself it is our duty to tell him, and so far as we can see that he does nothing that will thus bring harm upon himself. This slogan of business, "I'll get him before he gets me," is to find no place in the experience of the Christian. "They all do it," makes no difference to the man of Christ ; he refuses to do it simply because others do it. Not what others do, but what Jesus would have him do is the standard by which the disciple of Christ orders his life.

It may not be amiss in this connection to say a word to the customer even as we have spoken a word to the merchant. Dishonesty may be exhibited in the buying of goods just as much as in the selling of them. A young man went into a clothing store not long ago to buy a suit of clothes. After trying on several suits, he at last found one that seemed to please him.

"How much is this suit worth," said he to the merchant.

"Twenty-five dollars," was the reply.

"What," said the young man in affected amazement, "twenty-five dollars for this suit. Why, it doesn't seem to me to be worth that much." He then began to find fault with the suit, its fit and material, and said :

"Well, I don't think I really need a suit anyway."

The merchant was desirous of selling the suit, for he was in need of the money. Finally, the young man said:

"Why, it seems to me that there is a defect in this suit, see here." And pointing to some pretended defect, he said, "Well, I'll tell you what I'll do. I will give you twenty dollars for the suit, for that's all it is worth."

Needing the sale, the merchant let the suit go for that price. As soon as the young man reached home, he said to his wife:

"Well, I got a great bargain in a suit. The merchant wanted twenty-five dollars for it, and it is worth it, too; but I made off as though I did not want the suit, and told him there was a flaw in its make-up, so he let me have the suit for twenty dollars. Wasn't I smart? Why, that suit is worth thirty dollars if it is worth one." "It is naught, it is naught, saith the buyer: but when he is gone his way then he boasteth" (Proverbs 20:14).

There can surely be no question in the mind of any honest man that this young man was thoroughly dishonest. And yet is not this an incident that is occurring daily, and a bargain that is being driven by many people who would resent being called dishonest. Yet such dealing is down-right dishonesty. Such an action is not in the nature of a shrewd bargain, it partakes of the character of downright fraud and dishonesty, a thing utterly unworthy of any honest man, let alone anyone professing to be a follower of Jesus Christ.

HONESTY WILL BE MANIFESTED BY OWING NO MAN
ANYTHING.

The Christian business man will pay his debts. He will not make loans which he has no reasonable right

to expect that he can pay back. Rather than involve himself in debt, Lord Macaulay sold the gold medals which he had won at Cambridge.

The Christian man in business will not live beyond his income. That is dishonesty. "Pay as you go," is a good maxim. If you cannot pay, do not go. There are men in every community who live a life of dishonesty by this manner of petty thieving—making small loans and incurring small bills which they never intend to pay, or which they know when they incur the indebtedness that they cannot pay. Debt is a foe to a man's honesty. Live this month on what you earned last month, not on what you are going to earn next month.

Shall a Christian man go into debt? is a very serious question to many. It is perfectly right to borrow, providing you see your way clear to pay it back at the promised time. It can hardly be said that the Bible absolutely forbids indebtedness. Indeed, in the Old Testament at least, provision is made for borrowing. Jesus says: "From him that would borrow from thee, turn not thou away." The phrase, "Owe no man anything," has been made to suffer from incorrect interpretation. While in one breath it tells us to "owe no man anything," in the next it tells us that we are to constantly be in debt—"to love one another." The indebtedness of love is just as real and just as serious in the sight of God as the indebtedness of money is both in His sight and in the eyes of men.

A Christian man will meet his indebtedness whenever he is able to do so. He will not hold off his creditors or those to whom he is indebted if he has the means with which to meet his obligations. And yet, how often do we find a man who is well able to pay his debts postponing their payment until some future time. This kind of dealing is wrong for a Christian. God's Word

is very clear and explicit on this matter. Proverbs 3:27, 28: "Withhold not good from them to whom it is due, when it is in the power of thine hand to do it. Say not unto thy neighbor, Go, and come again, and tomorrow I will give; when thou hast it by thee." To act in this way is to show oneself to be a thief. Withhold not good from the *owners* thereof, says the text; thereby clearly teaching that what one holds back from another under such circumstances is in reality stealing.

The exercise of this Christian principle of Love in our business dealings will do away with all forms of oppression, and limit, if not abolish false competition.

The manifestation of such a spirit in business would lead the employer to see to it that his employees were paid a living wage. It cannot for one moment be doubted that many large corporations are paying nothing short of starvation wages. It is estimated that seventy-five per cent of women employed in Chicago get less than ten dollars a week. This is not a living wage. No wonder that there are five hundred thousand fallen women in the United States. How can a girl be expected to dress as some of our large stores, for example, demand that they should dress, on such a small wage? Is there not a lesson for such employers in the words of James 5:1-4?

1 Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you.

2 Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten.

3 Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.

4 Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.

Then, again, love will have its effect upon the false competition so prevalent today. There is a legitimate competition which the Christian business man cannot

very well avoid. It is in the business world and he must face it. But he will deal with it in the spirit of the Master, ever remembering the law of love in his dealing with his brother. The present mode of competition is, confessedly, a shameful and disgraceful thing. Little do some of these magnates care who go down in the struggle or how many lives are ruined and taken and destroyed, or how many a business goes to the wall, or how many widows and orphans are stripped of the little left them on which to live, if only their interests are conserved and their wealth increased. The fact that the wealth of the world has passed into the hands of but a few men indicates very clearly, it seems to us, that the present condition of competition is by no means conducted according to the spirit in which Jesus Christ would have His followers conduct their business.

THE CHRISTIAN AND
THE FAMILY

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHRISTIAN AND THE FAMILY.

THERE is no more important institution in the human race than the family. It has been said that the New Testament pays more attention to the fact and details of the family than to the church. The family is God's unit; the church is the family enlarged; indeed, it would seem as if heaven itself were but a family still more greatly enlarged: it is the Father's house of many mansions, the "family in heaven." The heavenly family is the perfection of the earthly.

Socially, the family is really the first circle of society; all else in life grows out of it. The apron-strings of the mother are the reins of government of the nation; and no nation is stronger or weaker than its family life. A nation's strong, pure, sturdy, faithful family life accounts for that nation's integrity, permanence and power. A lax family life in any nation is the reason of her decaying weakness and absence of real controlling power in the affairs of nations.

The family is so important that it will abide when all other institutions have passed away—it abides even in eternity. Heaven will reveal not the passing away of the family idea but the submerging of the earthly into the heavenly ideal.

WHAT IS MEANT BY THE FAMILY?

By the family is meant the collective body of persons who form one household under one head and one do-

mestic government, including parents, children, and servants.—*Century Dictionary*.

WHAT IS MEANT BY A CHRISTIAN FAMILY?

By a Christian family is meant not any family that happens to be fortunate enough to have its lot cast in a Christian country; nor a family in which the true God is recognized as opposed to the heathen family with its idol worship. A Christian family is one in which husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants have submitted their lives to Christ; a home in which Christ is the Head and the continual Guest; a home in which the Bible is read daily, and the voice of prayer heard as the expression of daily need; a home in which the beginning and the end of whose conversation is "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever." This may seem to be the presentation of an ideal family, and it may be questioned by some as to whether such a family really exists. With this challenge we are not now concerned. That the New Testament presents such an ideal there can be no reasonable question, and Christians—those to whom these words are addressed—realize that it is their duty and privilege to seek to attain that ideal in daily experience.

It should not be forgotten in this connection that we are dealing with the family, not from a social, or even from a moral viewpoint, but in the light of the Christian ideal, and from the spiritual viewpoint. Jesus Christ was more than a social reformer, or even a moral reformer; He was a spiritual regenerator.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE FAMILY—MARRIAGE.

At the foundation of the family lies the marriage bond. Marriage is one of the two institutions that

have come down to us from man's state of innocence. The Sabbath and marriage were instituted in the garden of Eden—"from the beginning." For this very reason we should be desirous of finding out what is its true nature and status.

That it was clearly God's intended purpose that His creatures should marry seems evident from the words found in Mark 10: 6-9:

6 But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.

7 For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife;

8 And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh.

9 What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.

"Male and female" God made them: the one incomplete without the other; the man needing the woman, and the woman needing the man, and both necessary to express the divine purpose and intention in the creation of the human race. Herein lies the necessity of both man and woman for the idea of the family. From this relationship the family springs. Without marriage there can be no family life.

Marriage, then, is a divine institution, and for this reason should not be treated nor "entered into lightly, but reverently, discreetly, and in the fear of God." God married the first human pair—this fact should do away with all frivolous and light views of marriage.

Polygamy is here condemned. No man must have two wives, certainly not at the same time. A man must be "the husband of one wife." The divine idea of marriage as herein set forth condemns not only the polygamy of Mormonism, but that of any other man who, even though legally divorced, has more than one wife at one time, whether he lives with her, or recognizes her as such or not. One sometimes wonders whether

the Mormon, who, because of his faith, has taken more than one wife, and refuses to cast her off without providing for her and her children, is not much more of a man and citizen, and much more to be desired, than the man who, obtaining a divorce on some flimsy pretext, casts off his wife and children to take another wife, and makes no provision for the wife and children whom he has thus cast off. The Mormon is considered by some to be a pure being compared with the modern divorcee.

WHY REMAIN UNMARRIED?

Do those who remain unmarried to that extent thwart God's creative purposes for them? Should we not teach our children that marriage is the divine intention for them, that God intends that they should marry and have children of their own? It would seem so. That there are legitimate reasons why marriage may in particular cases be dispensed with is also a clear teaching of the Word of God: Matthew 19:10-12:

10 His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry.

11 But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given.

12 For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.

There are physical reasons why it may not be well, if not impossible, for some people to marry. Others may be compelled, by some human law, like the soldier or the slaves in the employ of certain eastern monarchs, to refrain from this estate—"Made eunuchs of men"; while still others, like missionaries, desire to remain unmarried that they may give themselves more undividedly to the work of the Lord—"eunuchs for the king-

dom of heaven's sake." Under ordinary circumstances, however, God's will and purpose for man seems to be marriage. Will the unmarried please take notice, unless, as, thank God, is often the case, such are in the unmarried state for reasons above given.

It might seem at first sight that the teaching of the Apostle Paul contradicts this idea. Close study of his words, however, show us that he does not differ from Christ in this matter. It was only by reason of the peculiar stress of the times in which he was writing that the Apostle spoke as he did concerning the married estate. He himself describes one of the signs of "departing from the faith" on the part of some false teachers as "forbidding to marry." In his letter to Timothy he bids the young pastor exhort and teach "the younger women to marry." (1 Timothy 5:14.)

That Paul himself was a bachelor can not be proven. Indeed the great weight of evidence is the other way. It was considered a great shame for a Jewish young man to have attained the age of twenty and not to have married. Paul was an ideal Jew; he doubtless was obedient to this as well as to other traditions. Further, he was a member of the Sanhedrin, and, it is claimed on good authority, that no unmarried man could become a member of that body. We have no right to claim that because the Apostle, in addressing the "unmarried and widows," expressed his wish that they "remain even as I," he therefore advocated the unmarried state because he himself was unmarried. No, may we not rather believe that what the Apostle here speaks of with regard to himself is the power he has to hold his nature and passions in check so that there is no need for him to (re-)marry? Read carefully 1 Corinthians 7:1-9, and see if there is not ground for this view of the matter.

THE CHRISTIAN ETHICS CONTROLLING THE MARRIED STATE.

The ethics of Christian marriage are set forth clearly in 2 Corinthians 6:14-17, and 1 Corinthians 7:39. These scriptures read as follows:

14 Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?

15 And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?

16 And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

17 Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you,

39 The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

From these words it is evident that the matter of the nature of the choice of a partner in marriage is one that should be of great concern to the Christian. "*Only in the Lord*—" these words should be graven with a pen of iron upon every Christian heart. This is no arbitrary law—that a Christian must marry a Christian; it is absolutely necessary to the Christian's happiness: "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" Marriage must be based upon affinity not only physical, mental, and moral, but spiritual also. For the Christian any other marriage but a Christian marriage is forbidden. Some one has said that for a young man or young woman to be wholesomely married is the next thing to being regenerated.

Young Christian, be you man or woman, listen to these words—"at liberty to be married to whom she will, *only in the Lord*." Too many regard wealth, position, or title as the main qualification to a good marriage. They seem satisfied with these things. Many parents seem to think that their children are

“well-married” and have made a “good match” if such auspicious circumstances have characterized the marriage. It does not seem to have occurred to them to inquire as to whether the one seeking the hand of their child is a Christian or not. Think of it, *parents*; pause, and ponder ere you allow your consent to be given to an unchristian marriage! Think of a Christian parent giving his daughter to be the life companion of an unbeliever! Parents, are you giving your children in marriage to a child of God, or a child of the devil, which? Before God you must answer this question. Do you say you do not know? It is your business to find out. God holds you responsible for this thing. The religious question in marriage is the prime question.

Christian young woman, think and ponder what these scriptures mean before you marry a man who is not a believer on Jesus Christ. When you ask the consent of your earthly father, do not forget to consult your heavenly Father. Too often the heavenly Father is overlooked. Think of it, *Christian young woman*, what it means to marry an unconverted man: no family altar in your home, no voice of prayer, no reading of the Bible. When you or your children are sick or, perchance, dying, and you want some one to pray for you and for them, and you ask your husband to pray, he will reply: “I can’t pray.” If you ask him to read you some comforting portion of the Bible for which your soul is pining, he will answer: “I cannot read the Bible for you; I don’t know where to turn to find the comfort you need.” And when the angel of death shall hover over the cradle, or you yourself are passing through the valley of the shadow, and you need someone to beseech God for you, to help and comfort you, for you yourself are not able to pray—think of it, *Christian young woman*, to be married to a man who cannot minister to you in the most sacred things of your soul

in the most desperate hours of your life! Think and ponder before you leap.

MARRYING TO CONVERT.

Do not be deluded by the false philosophy that you may marry an unconverted man in order that you may lead him to Christ. The odds are a thousand to one that you will be led away from the Lord. Any pastor who would think it wise to give you a leaf out of his note-book, will tell you that some of the saddest incidents which have come under his notice and dealing have been those of broken-hearted wives, who once were sweet, Christian young women, but who married unconverted men, thinking that they would reform them after they were married to them. There can be no agreement between a Christian and an unbeliever. If an agreement is reached, it is an agreement, almost always, to give up prayer, asking the blessing at the table, and going to church.

Yet it shall be: thou shalt lower to his level day by day,

What is fine within thee growing coarse to sympathize with clay.

As the husband is, the wife is; thou art mated with a clown;

And the grossness of his nature will have weight to drag thee down.

He will hold thee, when his passion shall have spent its novel force,

Something better than his dog, a little dearer than his horse.

—Tennyson.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE IN CASE OF SUCH MARRIAGES?

If you have married an unconverted partner, what should you do? Stand by it; the relation must not be dissolved. Mixed marriages are to be continued, but *not commenced*; but if commenced, they must be continued in. The Christian, under such circumstances

must endeavor by a Christian life and conversation to win the unconverted partner to Christ. This position is clearly defined in the seventh chapter of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians.

The unconverted partner in this case is blessed by virtue of his or her union with the Christian: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." (1 Corinthians 7:14.) "I am not the rose, but I live with the rose, and am therefore sweet," is what the Arabian proverb says. And this is true of the benefit accruing to the unconverted partner in a mixed marriage. Even the tares in the wheatfield are sacred because of the wheat. The ungodly men of Israel were privileged because they belonged to a holy nation.

The children also of such a marriage are to be regarded as holy. They take their standing from the Christian parent because such parent is the nobler of the two. If the root be holy, then the branches also are holy. This is beautifully illustrated in the case of Timothy. Although his father was a Greek, yet because his mother was a Jewess and a believer, the son of that marriage, because of the faith of the mother, was counted holy (Cf. Acts 16:1-3; 2 Timothy 1:5).

DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE.

May the marriage bond, under any circumstances, be severed? Does the Christian view of marriage sanction divorce? If so, under what circumstances and conditions? There is no question pertinent to the subject we are now considering that is more vital in its answer and issue than this. No graver question confronts our national life than this one. We are told by statisticians that for every four marriages that take place in some of our cities and states, there is one divorce. This is

appalling. No nation can long allow such conditions to exist and not fall into the moral corruption and decay of Rome of olden days. There were from 80,000 to 100,000 divorces in the United States in 1910. It is claimed that soon half of the couples married will be divorced. Satan has always tried to deceive people on the question of marriage and divorce. In the first place he tries to get a Christian to marry an unbeliever; then he tries to get a backslider to marry an unbeliever under the pretence that he himself is not a Christian now any way; and lastly, by trying to induce one of the married parties to leave the other and marry some one else. And as some one has well said, "There are three kinds of persons who agree with the devil in these things: first, those already in the tangle; second, those having friends mixed up in the matter; and thirdly, those who want to take the risk."

Here is Scriptural teaching on the subject of divorce and remarriage. Let us ponder it well, and then draw some conclusions:

MATTHEW 5:32; 19:3-9

32 But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

3 The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?

4 And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female.

5 And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?

6 Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

7 They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?

8 He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

9 And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

MARK 10:2-12.

2 And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him.

3 And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you?

4 And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement and to put her away.

5 And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept.

6 But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.

7 For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife;

8 And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh.

9 What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

10 And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same matter.

11 And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.

12 And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

LUKE 16:18.

18 Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery.

ROMANS 7:1-3.

1 Know ye not, brethren (for I speak to them that know the law), how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?

2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

3 So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

1 CORINTHIANS 7:10, 11, 39.

10 And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband:

11 But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband; and let not the husband put away his wife.

39 The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord.

We make the following deductions from these scriptures:

First, that the divine purpose regarding marriage is that it is an indissoluble bond, one that nothing but death can sever. So long as husband and wife are alive they are "one flesh" whether they are living together or separated, even though that separation be by law. Legal separation may not be in accordance with the divine mind in the premises.

Some authorities claim that "desertion" is also a ground for divorce (1 Corinthians 7:11). We leave the reader to judge if this particular scripture teaches it.

Second, that divorce may be granted only for one reason, fornication or adultery. On no other ground does Christ sanction divorce. For the Christian there is, therefore, no other ground. The question of the Pharisees was to this effect: May a man put away his wife for *any* cause. In Old Testament times the Jew who did not care any more for his wife, or who preferred another, or perchance, did not like her cooking, simply gave the wife notice to quit his home; such notice was deemed sufficient in his eyes. Moses saw to what immoral lengths such a practice would lead, and so he commanded every man who desired to put away his wife to come to court, present his plea, and, if granted, a written decree was then given to the wife in order that she might in some way be protected. This was done because of the hardness of men's hearts in the matter of putting away their wives.

Now, no matter whether divorces were granted in Old Testament times for causes other than that mentioned by Christ (namely, fornication), this much is clear, that from the time the Christian's Master laid down the principle that only on the ground of adultery (or fornication, which refers to some uncleanness occurring before marriage, during the period of betrothal, for example), may divorce be granted.

Third, that only the death of either party makes remarriage permissible. The marriage of one party to another during the life-time of the other partner is stigmatized as an *act* of adultery; indeed, the whole *state* resulting from such an act is to be known as an adulterous state. Inasmuch as the Bible tells us that "no adulterer shall enter the kingdom of heaven," it becomes Christians to duly weigh what these words mean.

There are three parenthetical words, however, in two of the above quotations, which *seem*, to some people, to allow remarriage, without guilt, in the case of the *innocent party* who has secured a divorce based on the sin spoken of by our Lord. (Paul's sin of desertion does not, so far as we are able to see, give any grounds for remarriage—"let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband.") These parenthetical words are: "Except for fornication." Mark you, but *three parenthetical words*—and with these three words a large liberty seems to be taken. It is considered a fundamental rule in the interpretation of the Scriptures that where you have, for example, three clear passages and one that is not clear dealing with any one subject, the doctrine contained therein is to build upon the clear passages and not upon those that are uncertain. Now, in the instance before us we have some twenty or more verses that are clear on the subject, namely, that remarriage during the life of one's partner is adultery—and but three words, and they are but parenthetical, and claimed by some to have been added to the gospel of Mark (the so-called original gospel), that seem to infer (note the words *seem* and *infer*) that remarriage may, under certain circumstances, be contracted by a divorced party during the lifetime of the other party without such act being stigmatized as an act and a state of adultery. Is this treating the Scriptures fairly?

The question may be asked, "What then should people do who have remarried after a divorce which from a Scriptural viewpoint may be considered invalid? The Chicago newspapers, a few weeks ago, printed an account of the divorce and remarriage of a certain Chicago citizen. It seems, from the evidence submitted, that this man's first wife who at the time was an inmate of a sanitarium, had been persuaded, in some dishonest way to sign her name to a document that would give her husband grounds for divorce according to the laws of the state of Illinois. The divorce was accordingly secured, and within a few days after, at least a short while after, this man married another woman. The relatives of the first wife were naturally incensed at such conduct, and, after consultation, succeeded in having this man and his attorney tried for perjury or some such charge. Without going further into the details of the case, suffice it to say that the presiding judge annulled the second marriage, separated the divorced man from his second wife, thus separating and annulling an illegal bond. If the law of the land, which, in this instance, had been violated, had the right to separate two persons already united in marriage, why may not the law of God, in like manner violated, also make such a separation? But what about the consequences? The consequences are not in the question here. At least the presiding judge did not think so. The Scriptures insist upon right doing irrespective of the consequences. The law of the state of Illinois, compelled these two people to separate and never to live together again, during the lifetime of the first wife, as man and wife. The law of God has the same right. The effect of the enforcement of such a law would be to make people less desirous of securing a divorce and much more careful about the choice of a partner for marriage in the first instance.

THE CHRISTIAN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUSBAND
AND WIFE.

What have the Scriptures to say with regard to the relationship that should exist in the Christian home between husband and wife?

THE HUSBAND THE HEAD OF THE WIFE.

The relationship between husband and wife as set forth in the picture presented to us by the Apostle in his delineation of the ideal family is full of helpful instruction. This picture is found in Ephesians 5:22-33, and I Corinthians 11:8, 9:

22 Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord.

23 For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body.

24 Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.

25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

26 That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.

27 That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.

28 So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself.

29 For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church:

30 For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

31 For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.

32 This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church.

33 Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband.

8 For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man.

9 Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.

It is a relation of loving headship. Too often do we find people making a joke of the headship of the husband. Yet, while recognizing the spiritual equality of both husband and wife, the Scriptures are emphatic in their statement of the fact that the husband is the head of the family. From the beginning this has been so. God said to Eve, "Thy desire shall be towards thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." This is a law that is deep seated in the feminine nature; indeed, woman's dependence upon man is, if she only knew it, her greatest weapon.

This idea of headship on the part of the man does not mean the inferiority of the wife and the superiority of the husband. Woman was taken from man's side; not from his feet, to be beneath him; not from his head, to be above him: but from his side, to be equal with him. Headship does not imply that the husband is superior in all qualities to the wife; for very often indeed the reverse is the case; but only that he is her superior in matters pertaining to the government of the family. Though the true wife recognizes the deficiencies of her husband, she nevertheless recognizes that he is the head of the home, and the centre of the family; and she will accord him that place. If we admit the relationship existing between Christ and His Church—which, as Christians, we do—we must admit that the "husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the Church."

The husband is not the *boss* or the *governor*, but the *head*. The relationship that exists between the head and the body is just the relationship that exists between the husband and wife. The body cannot be hurt without the head feeling it: the head will not allow any harm to be inflicted, knowingly, upon the body. Naturally, a man takes exceedingly good care that he does not cause his own body any harm. The relationship between

husband and wife should be characterized by just such care and solicitation.

It is to be a *headship of love*. Three times the idea of love is emphasized in this Scripture, as if to indicate that it was needed to correct or qualify any wrong notions of sovereignty over, or of the subordination of, the wife. The husband, as the head of the wife, is to love his wife "as Christ loved the Church"—that is, to the point of sacrificing His life for her; he is to love his wife "even as his own body"—that is just as he cares for and protects his own body so should he regard his wife; he is to love his wife "even as himself"—as being really himself, which she is, for they two are "one flesh." The husband is commanded not to govern, but to love his wife. Given a husband who is such a "head" as here described, there will be found no difficulty on the part of the wife in recognizing such headship and in rendering due obedience. A husband, reckless of these obligations, virtually ceases to have any such claim upon either wife or family.

A RELATIONSHIP OF LOVING CONSIDERATION.

I Peter 3:7: "Husbands, dwell with your wives according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life: that your prayers be not hindered."

Because the wife is the "weaker vessel" she is to have the tender and loving consideration of the husband. He is to consider her comparative weakness. The disparity between the sexes was the cause of the degradation of the woman among the heathen; Christianity makes it a ground of tender appeal for loving consideration. The weakness of woman is to be her best plea to her husband for his consideration. He is to protect her name, honor, and home; to stand between her and the world, and shield her from harm, and calumny.

He must manifest loving consideration for her pleasure and happiness. "He that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife." (1 Corinthians 7:33.) Note the phrase, "How he may please his wife." The Christian husband will continually ask himself as to how he may plan for the pleasure and happiness of his wife. He will not be selfish in his pleasures and enjoyments; he will see to it that his wife is a sharer of his joys as well as a divider of his sorrows.

The Christian husband will be proud of his wife, no matter into what company he may take her. "The woman is the glory of the man," says the Apostle. The wife is the honor, the ornament, and the delight of the husband. This ought to be true even though the wife be not as prepossessing as in younger days, or as cultured in manners, or as handsomely dressed as many other women.

There must be no bitterness on the part of the Christian husband toward his wife. "Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them," says the Apostle. This exhortation means that a man is not to provoke or exasperate his wife; nor is he to be a continual scold. Many a man who has not the courage to abuse any other woman, or any man, is coward enough to make his wife a target for all his venom and abuse. Bitter words, sour looks, imperious, rough, rude words and acts—these should by no means be heaped upon the wife of one's bosom. Wives are exhorted to love and obey their husbands as those who "are not afraid, and without any amazement" (terror). The brutish actions of some husbands keep their wives in a continual state of fear. The Christian husband will avoid this evil.

LOVING PROVISION FOR THE WIFE.

Peter describes the relationship between husband and wife as that of "being heirs together." Paul says:

“If any provide not for his own, and specially those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.” The husband is to provide for the temporal needs of his wife just as liberally and as well as he provides for his own needs. Yet many a wife today does not get as much spending money as the hired girl. The Christian husband will not dress in broadcloth and silk hat while his wife wears calico and a hat that is many seasons old. Husband and wife are “heirs together.” They should share a common purse.

But the Christian husband will not only provide for the temporal needs of his wife, he will see to it that the needs of her soul are met. The husband is the priest of the family—at least, according to the Bible, and by right divine, even though in point of fact the average wife, as a rule, has “all the religion of the family.” The husband is the saviour of the body (his wife) as Christ is the Saviour of the Church. If the wife is lost the husband is to blame, unless he can give a satisfactory account of his life to God in this matter. Yet how few husbands really realize that they are responsible for the souls of their wives? How few really pray with their wives, or meditate with them on spiritual matters? The husband is to “sanctify” the wife, he is to lift her up, and make her holy. Is this done? Some women lose the lustre of all delicacy and refinement under the influence of the men they call their husbands. If a man does all in his power to promote his wife’s holiness, to save her from all that is mean, and coarse, and vulgar, and that degrades the character, or pains the soul, she can never be the victim of any unholy appetite or lust, but holiness will sanctify every relation in life, and he will try to present her with joy and without blemish, even as Christ the Church, before the throne of God with exceeding great delight.

THE RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN WIFE TO HER
HUSBAND.

This relationship is set forth in the quotation from Paul's letter to the Ephesians 5:22-33, (see under relation of husband to wife, p. 99).

THE CHRISTIAN WIFE WILL BE HUSBAND-LOVING.

"Teach the . . . women . . . to love their husbands" (Titus 2:4). So important is this requirement on the part of the Christian wife that it is assumed in all other scriptures dealing with the relationship of husband and wife. Love lies at the basis of the marriage relation. All marriages of convenience, or self-interest, or for wealth or title are by this principle condemned, as is also a loveless marriage. Marriage is not to be degraded into a commercial transaction. Love is the axis upon which matrimony ought to swing. It is expected of the wife that she love her husband just as it is expected and commanded of the husband that he love his wife. Reciprocal love there must be in the true Christian marriage bond.

LOVE MANIFESTS ITSELF IN LOVING SUBMISSION
AND OBEDIENCE.

This fact is recognized in the institution of marriage in which the "husband is the head of the wife." It also has its foundation in nature; as the head of every man is Christ, so the head of woman is the man (1 Corinthians 11:3). Adam was first made, then Eve: man was not made for the woman, but the woman for the man (1 Corinthians 11:8, 9). Is not the wife, the dependent and weaker vessel, who is in need of protection, while the husband excels in those qualities

which entitle him to command? Christianity does elevate woman, it is true, but it does not release her from the duty of submission to her husband. The Gospel of Jesus Christ has exalted woman to a high plane, but it has not unsexed her. If it was necessary to emphasize the truth of loving submission in the days of the Apostle when woman had not yet been exalted as she now is, it surely is more necessary to proclaim it in this day of the so-called "new woman," who is constantly clamoring for her "rights." There can be no dual authority in the Christian home; the final decisions must rest with the husband according to the divine arrangement. The true Christian wife will recognize this divine order and submit to it as unto the Lord, just as the Church submits to Christ.

Such a loving submission is the surest way of maintaining that loving relationship which should characterize the Christian family. Says Fuller, concerning the wife: "She commandeth her husband on any equal matter by constantly obeying him." Nature to be commanded must be obeyed. So the wife governs her husband by obeying him—a fact which many husbands and wives, too, know right well. For wives have a way of letting husbands think that they are having their own way in matters, while all the while the wife is getting her way—and maybe it is best that it is so. The husband rules his wife with authority; she rules him with love—and wins out every time. The wife ought by all means to please her husband, and the husband ought by no means to displease his wife—there you have the whole secret of a happy married life.

The submission and obedience required of the wife towards her husband is not the obedience of a servant to his master, or a maid to her mistress, or even that of a child to a parent. It is a submission that recognizes the husband's rule as tender, wise, just, and good:

and on the part of the husband that recognizes that husband and wife are "heirs together of the grace of life," that the wife is the weaker vessel and therefore in need of his most tender and loving protection and care.

LIMITED OBEDIENCE.

This submission and obedience is, further, limited in its nature. It is not to be an obedience and submission against the Christian conscience of the wife; nor must the authority of the husband enter into the sphere of what the wife considers to be her duty towards God. The husband has no command over what is God's. For example, the unconverted husband has absolutely no right to prohibit his wife from observing family worship, or prevent her going to the house of God. Nor has he any right to expect to compel her to go to the theatre or play cards, for example, if her conscience is thereby defiled. The wife is supreme in the realm of Christian consciousness. This the husband must understand.

The obedience of the wife should be like that of the Church to Jesus Christ—not forced or feigned, but growing out of a love and affection for, dependence upon, and a recognition of the just grounds of authority and headship.

THE CHRISTIAN WIFE WILL BE HOME-LOVING.

"Teach the . . . women to be . . . keepers at home" (Titus 2:4, 5). Bad housekeeping does great harm to religion. Paul speaks of those wives who wander about from house to house, being idle; and not only idle, but tattlers also, and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not. Such wives are com-

manded to "guide the house (so as to) give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully" (1 Timothy 5:14). The cause of Christ suffers severely from such conduct—"the word of God is blasphemed" because of it.

The sphere of the Christian wife is not society, nor the world, but the home. The cause of Christ gains nothing, but on the contrary loses much, when the home is neglected. The husband's best interests are preserved when the wife is industrious at home, and makes the home the centre of attraction by its order, cleanliness, and helpful enjoyment.

Sometimes one hears complaint that the home is too limited a sphere for an aggressive wife, and so there is a gravitation from the home to the platform, or at least a longing desire to appear before the world or society in a more public way. It may be that some women are called upon to take their places before the public as platform women, but it does seem to many thinking people that a wife can do far more for her husband and family, and for society too by reinforcing her husband in the work of life and rearing her children for positions of trust. Of this we may be assured—that no woman has a right to go to the club, or appear as a platform woman at woman's congresses who is guilty of leaving her children on the street uncared for, and who is indifferent to the needs and requirements of her home and family.

The care of husband and children is the duty of the wife much more than pleading for woman suffrage. It would be very much better to have a woman without the ballot than without the home instinct. It would be far better to have a mother who can raise a boy to cast the right kind of ballot than one who allows the neglect of her own children while advocating "votes for women."

WOMEN AND THE BALLOT.

Why do women want the ballot? What advantage is there to be gained thereby? There are a great many very serious-minded women who are in great doubt as to the wisdom of such a move; they wonder whether it would not be better to train the rising generation in the home. How many women would go to the polls even if the privilege were allowed them? And if they did go, what kind of vote would they cast? The probabilities are that their vote would not change existing conditions. The vote might be larger, but it would not necessarily be different. Very likely the wives, sisters, and daughters would vote as do the husbands, fathers, and brothers. It is claimed that if women had the right to vote it would settle the temperance question. Would it? Do not multitudes of women drink? There are almost 500,000 fallen women in the United States, and, without question, every one of them would vote straight for the saloon. Crowds of rough women would go to the polls, while many respectable ones would stay at home.

We are told that if women had the right to vote then women would receive larger wages. But would they? Is this certain? Who that has heard a woman trying to beat down the price of the washerwoman or the hired-girl, or the seamstress, can believe that such results will inevitably follow women voting. Are not women, as a rule, harder on their own sex than men are? We are not opposed to woman suffrage, nor to the right of being able to vote being granted to women, we are only pleading for a home-keeping wife rather than a club-woman.

It does seem that a woman who is taxed as a property holder ought to have something to say as to how that property shall be controlled. Certainly, our

plea is not against women who want to vote, but against those who neglect their home and family life in order to be known as public women.

THE HOME A LARGE SPHERE.

A good wife makes a good, and oftentimes a great husband. Dwight L. Moody, the great evangelist, said: "I owe to my wife all my successes." Said Abraham Lincoln: "All that I am or hope to be I owe to my mother." All that was admirable in the character of Henry the Sixth was the reflection of the character of his wife Margaret. William, Prince of Orange, was restored to the right path by his wife Mary. Andrew Jackson, the president and soldier, had his mightiest reinforcement in the person and influence of his wife. George Washington, the father of this great republic, wore a locket around his neck for forty years containing the picture of the one who had been the greatest inspiration of his life. It was the consciousness of her presence that led him to kneel in the snow in Valley Forge. To her he attributed the honors of the presidential chair. Said Luther: "I would not exchange my poverty with my wife for all the riches of the world without her."

What shall we say to these things? Are they not proof sufficient that there can be no greater sphere of influence for the wife and mother than the home, and that a woman exerts her greatest influence within that sphere? Such honors as these mentioned above are surely sufficient to satisfy the desire of any true woman. Why, the only chance some women have to influence the world is through their husbands; for they have no progeny. Washington, Shakespeare, Sumner, Burke, Pitt, Lord Nelson, Cowper, Pope, Addison, Bacon, Macaulay, Cromwell, Spencer—all

died without progeny. When the French warriors on their way to Rheims had about concluded to give up attacking the castle of Troyes because it was so heavily garrisoned Joan of Arc entered the room and told them that they would be inside the castle in three days. "We would willingly wait six days," said one of the leaders. "Six," cried out Joan, "you shall be in it tomorrow!" And under her leadership they entered it on the morrow. On a smaller scale every man has his garrison to subdue and obstacles to level, and every wife may be an inspired Joan of Arc to her husband.

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS
FUTURE REWARD

CHAPTER V.

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS FUTURE REWARD.

WHEN one is considering the advisability of making an investment in business he naturally asks himself what returns are promised from the investment and what prospects of dividends or profits such a venture may afford. The promised outlook has something to do with the investment, and to a large extent decides whether it shall be made. It is for what the future holds out by way of prospect and promise that many men sacrifice the comforts of home and friends and cast their lot in such wilds as those of Alaska. Such investments men in the business world are making all the time. Nor would we say that they are moved by wrong motives in so doing. It is by no means wrong to hold out the promise of future gain and glory as an incentive to present duty. Our Saviour did this when, in dealing with the rich young ruler, he required him to sell all that he had, and distribute it to the poor, and follow Him, and, as a reward, he should have treasure in heaven.

The Christian is constantly bidden to look unto the recompense of his reward. The saints of the New Testament, like those of the Old, die "not having received the promises" in all their fulness. Nevertheless faith gives them confidence in their hope that some future day will reveal that they have not believed nor trusted in vain.

"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most pitiable," says the Apostle. If you measure things by what you can see and handle, then the Christian is silent—he has nothing to say. He has chosen a life of self-denial which must end in self-obliteration. He will not indulge in the pleasures of the world, and if there are no pleasures in the darkness into which he is about to enter then he has miscalculated, and is therefore of all men most pitiable. He has refused many pleasures of the world, and if there is nothing for him to gain in the age to come he has made a foolish choice. If all this be true, then the Christian simply falls down dead; if he has no home to go, no God to welcome him, no King to say: "Well done, exchange mortality for life"; then he has trusted in vain. But this is not true. "Godliness is profitable unto all things; having the promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come." "What shall it profit me," says Paul, "if, after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, the dead rise not?"

The Christian is conscious that this life does not end it all; he firmly and unwaveringly believes in a future home and reward. He looks forward to a day when all the rich promises of the Bible shall be fulfilled. He knows that he is begotten again to a living hope. It is to this *hope* that our thoughts are now directed.

THE BELIEVER IN CHRIST NEVER DIES.

In John 11:25, 26, Jesus says: "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." And again in 8:51 (R. V.): "If a man keep my word, he shall never see

death." What did the Master mean by these words? He shall never "see" death—what does that mean? It means that he shall never gaze upon death as the outlook or the objective of his life. There are but two spheres: life, and death. The moment a man believes in Jesus Christ he passes out of the sphere of death into that of life; life, not death, is henceforth his outlook (John 5:24). The believer is nowhere told to look forward to death; since he believed, death has ceased to be the object of his gaze. The Christian shall "never die." In the words of Jesus to Martha: "Believest thou this?" That those dead shall one day live because of Him—this it is not hard to believe: but that those living shall never die because of their faith in Him—well, this seems more difficult to believe. Nevertheless it is a fact. The death of the body is no more to be considered death to the Christian, than the life of the body is to be counted life as compared with that "life which is life indeed." This does not mean that Christians will not see the grave, but that, in the deepest sense they will not die. The life of faith survives the shock of death, which is but a momentary shadow upon the life which is very far better.

There are no Christian dead. The God of the Christian is the God of the living, and not of the dead. This is the truth enunciated by God to Moses at the burning bush. Moses was to understand that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were still living.

CHRISTIANS FALL ASLEEP IN CHRIST.

A distinction is made between dying and falling asleep, in 1 Thessalonians 4:14: "For if we believe that Jesus died . . . so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." Jesus died, that is, He tasted

and drained the cup to its bitterest dregs, in order that we might not have to do the same. He died, we sleep. He has abolished death and brought life and immortality to light.

Three things are suggested by the term "sleep": continued existence, repose, awakening. In what the world calls death the believer simply closes his eyes upon all that is mortal and immediately opens them upon that which is eternal. What a blessed awakening! "Why make ye this ado, and weep? The damsel is not dead, but sleepeth."

The living presence of Christ is what greets the Christian in the place of death. How beautifully this is brought out in the Shepherd Psalm (23:4), "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me." Note the change in the personal pronoun. All through the psalm, up to this point, the psalmist has used the third personal pronoun "he"; but now he uses the second person, "Thou." Why? Because in the hour when we pass through the valley of the shadow, no third person, no loved one, parent or child, can go with us through that narrow vale. If we have no Christ, we press our way through that valley alone, and missing Him, our stumbling feet must fall. The assurance of the believer, however, is this: that Christ is with him in the hour of departure; that He stands by the bedside of the saint as the light of earth fails, ready to lead him through the valley into the home beyond the skies. It was this presence that led Mr. Moody to say: "Is this death? why there is no dark valley; He is with me." It is the living Christ, therefore, that takes the place in the experience of the believer of what the world calls, and is in reality to the worldling, death.

O, to have no Christ, no Saviour; no hand to clasp
thine own:

Through the dark, dark vale of shadows, thou must
press thy way alone.

How much better to be able to say:

And when, at last, I near the shore; and the fearful
breakers roar

'Twixt me and my heavenly rest;

Then, while leaning on Thy breast, may I hear Thee
say to me:

"Fear not, I will pilot thee."

THE BELIEVER IS TO HAVE A GLORIFIED BODY.

These "bodies of our humiliation" are to be transformed "like unto His own glorious body." When "we shall see Him, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." These are the glorious promises which make the outlook of the believer bright and glowing.

The salvation or redemption which Christ has provided for the believer is effective in the redemption of his body as well as his soul. This body, even here, is the temple of the Holy Ghost. The dust of the believer is precious to Christ. He will raise "it" up at the last day. On the resurrection morning the grave of every believer will be as empty as was that tomb in Joseph's garden on that first Easter morn of our age twenty centuries ago. This body of ours shall tabernacle, or pitch its tent upon hope. God shall raise us up again, and, in our flesh "we shall see God."

There is no room here to deal with the question as to how the dead are to be raised and with what body they are to come forth. That identity is preserved, there can be no serious doubt; that these same bodies shall be raised, tooth, hair, and nail identical—this, it is not necessary to maintain.

The resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ is the guarantee to the believer of this promise being fulfilled. "And yet," says W. J. Bryan, "it hardly seems necessary that one should rise from the dead to convince us that there is to be a resurrection of our own bodies. If the Father deigns to touch with divine power, the cold and pulseless heart of the buried acorn, and to make it to burst forth from its prison walls, will He leave neglected in the earth the soul of man made in the image of its Creator? If He stoops to give to the rose-bush, whose withered blossoms float upon the autumn breeze, the sweet assurance of another spring-time, will he refuse the words of hope and cheer to the sons of men when the frosts of winter come? If matter, mute and inanimate, though changed by the forces of nature into a multitude of forms, can never die, will the spirit of man suffer annihilation, when it has paid a brief visit, like a royal guest to this tenement of clay? No, I am as sure that there is another life as I am that I live today. When I was in Cairo, I secured a few grains of wheat that had slumbered for more than 3,000 years in an Egyptian tomb. As I looked at them, this thought came into my mind: if one of those grains of wheat had been planted on the banks of the Nile the year after it grew, and all its lineal descendents planted and replanted from then until now, its progeny would today be sufficiently numerous to feed the teeming millions of the world. There is in the grain of wheat an invisible something which has power to discard the body that we see, and, from earth and air, to fashion for itself a new body, so much like the old one that we cannot tell the one from the other. And if this invisible germ of life in the grain of wheat can thus pass unimpaired through three thousand resurrections, I shall not doubt that my soul has

power to take to itself a new body suited to its new conditions when this earthly frame shall have crumbled into dust."

THE MEETING WITH OUR LOVED ONES.

Where are the Christian dead? Where are our loved ones whom we "have loved long since, and lost awhile"? In the Old Testament the departure of the saints of that day is characterized as being "gathered to their fathers," "gathered unto his people." How full of suggestion and comfort are these phrases. But how much more comforting the New Testament description of the believer's departure from this life: "Absent from the body, present with the Lord"; "to depart is to be with Christ, which is far better." Our loved ones then are with the Lord. And when we depart this life, where do we go? To be "with the Lord." Then we go to be where our loved ones are. Blessed thought!

What a great part the presence of our loved ones plays in our happiness here on the earth. They shall play a great part in our happiness yonder, too. How often we are asked: "Shall we be able to recognize our loved ones when we get to heaven?" Why not? Do we know them here? Shall we know less in heaven than we do down here? If Dives in hell, was able to recognize Lazarus in heaven, will not the believer in heaven be able to recognize those who are there? The disciples knew Christ after the resurrection, why may not we know our loved ones when they, too, transformed into His image and likeness, and, like Him, have their resurrection bodies? If Paul expected to be able to know his Thessalonian converts (1 Thessalonians 2:19, 20) in that day, shall we not be able to know our loved ones? If the disciples on the transfiguration mount knew Moses and Elias whom they

had never before seen, shall not we know those with whom we have lived for years, and whose very likeness is stamped indelibly upon our memory forever? If Saul the king, knew Samuel the prophet, after the latter's death, shall we be denied an equal knowledge with regard to our friends? Stephen knew Christ as he caught that beatific vision in the closing hours of his life. Dwight L. Moody claimed to have seen and recognized, in the last few moments of his life, his two departed grandchildren, Dwight and Irene. Shall not we be able to see, when we have washed the last sleep from our eyes in the river of life, just as much as these men saw before they had cast off this mortal coil? What did Jesus mean when he said to Martha: "Thy *brother* shall rise again"? Not Lazarus, but "thy brother"? Was there not hidden in those words the hope that these sisters would know Lazarus as their "brother"? We think so. What comfort did David the king find in his hour of bereavement, in the words, "He cannot come to me, but I shall go to him," if there were to be no recognition of the child as his very own? How does the Bible describe the departure of the believer? As a sleep. Do I cease to know my loved ones when, after a night's sleep, I awaken in the morning? Now "we know in part; then shall we know even as we have been known"—fully. If now, in this life, in which our knowledge is limited, we know our loved ones, can it be credible that in that future age, where all limitations in knowledge shall have passed away, we shall know less than we know here?

How shall we know them? That would be difficult, perhaps impossible to say. The disciples knew Moses and Elias whom they had never seen before and to whom, so far as the record goes, they had not been introduced. We may not need such trappings as "introductions" in order to acquaintance in the other

world. Mary knew Jesus by the tone of His voice; by the manner in which He pronounced her name. Would you not be able even yet to recognize the voice, though now long stilled, that used to call you by your first name? Know that voice? Yes, amid the burst of heaven's great orchestra you would recognize it. The disciples recognized Christ after His resurrection by the peculiar way in which He asked the blessing over the evening meal. They had seen Him do it before His death, and here, after the resurrection, He still has His own peculiar way of doing things. Is there not at least a suggestion in this for us that will throw some light upon the means of recognition in heaven?

In seeking for comfort along this line let us not be too dogmatic in our search for the truth. Not that we should be extravagant in our deductions; only we should not make it unduly hard for a man to believe that he will have the joy of recognizing his loved ones in the glory.

And if by grace I reach that blessed sky;
I fain would see the same, and not another;
The very father that I used to see,
The mother that has nursed me on her knee.

But oh! how dark, how drear, how lone
Would seem the brightest world of bliss,
If wandering through each radiant zone,
We failed to find the loved of this!
If there no more the ties should twine,
Which death's cold hand has severed,
Ah, then, these stars in mockery shine,
More hateful as they shine for ever.

It cannot be!—Each hope and fear
That blights the eye or clouds the brow,
Proclaims there is a happier sphere
Than this black world that holds us now!

There is a voice which sorrow hears,
 When heaviest weighs life's galling chain;
 'Tis heaven that whispers "Dry thy tears—
 The pure in heart shall meet again."

—*Anonymous.*

THE BELIEVER SHALL BE REWARDED FOR ALL THAT HE
 HAS DONE IN LIFE.

"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, . . . whether it be good or evil" (2 Corinthians 5:10). "Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord" (Ephesians 6:8).

Some day the believer is to be "manifested"—for that is the meaning of the word "appear"—before Christ. In this world the believer is in a sense *incognito*; this life is a masquerade. Ofttimes the Christian is misunderstood, misrepresented, maligned. He suffers for well-doing, when, evidently, he ought to be rewarded for it in some manifest way. Apparently he receives no recognition for much of the good he does, and an exceeding amount of criticism for both the good he does not do and for the evil he does. His deeds are questioned; sinister motives are attributed to him when, in devotion to his Lord, he does some little bit of service; nobody seems to recognize his work. Without question all of God's servants have, at some time or other, felt the sting of all this. Let us rest satisfied that some day, when we shall stand before our Lord, every little bit of service, every kind word, even the smallest deed, like the cup of cold water, will have its recognition and reward. The believer is to "receive" or better "receive back" his recompense of reward. This means that every good deed carries with it its recompense. If it is not given here, it will be there.

When one of Verdi's great compositions was rendered for the first time in Florence it was received with tremendous applause by a huge assembly. Verdi came forward to acknowledge the applause, but stood unmoved by the torrent of enthusiasm which swirled about him. All that tremendous applause was not powerful enough to turn his gaze from the face of his teacher and master who sat in the audience. Without the master's intelligent approval, the tumult of the throng brought no happiness to his soul. So is it with us. What will it profit even though we receive the applause of the multitudes if, at last, we fail to be well-pleasing to Christ? On the other hand what shall we care for the condemning voices of the crowd, if we have the assurance that at the last we shall hear from the lips of our Master the words, "Well done, good and faithful servant." That will be compensation more than sufficient for all that we have done for His name's sake. We shall not need to say much; for, in that day, the things we have done will speak for themselves. *The Homeletic Review* gives the following story which aptly illustrates the thought here expressed:

Mary lived in the tenement district of St. Louis. She was only thirteen, and she was the eldest of seven. Her mother was dying, and she called Mary to her bedside and said:

"I must leave you and you must be mother now to the children. Be patient with father; you know he is kind to us when he is not in drink, so be patient when he comes home and abuses you, and keep the children together. Don't let them be separated. God help you, the task is hard, and you so young!"

The hand slipped from Mary's shoulder and left a great burden resting there. Mary took it up bravely and for two years she toiled and slaved.

Then the hot summer weather found Mary too weak to withstand it and she came down with fever. A deaconess administered to her needs. One day Mary was very weak and she told the deaconess her story.

"Now I am dying," she said, "as mother did. I have been patient with father and I have kept the children together, but I am afraid to die. I have not gone to church because I have had no fit clothes, and I have been too tired of nights to say my prayers. Now what can I say to Jesus when I see Him up there?"

The deaconess took the frail little hands, hardened by toil for others, and said:

"Don't say anything, Mary, just show him your hands!"

When earth's last picture is painted, and the tubes
are all twisted and dried;

When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest
critic has died—

We shall rest, and faith we shall need it; sit down
for an eon or two,

'Till the Master of all good workmen shall set us to
work anew.

Then those that are good shall be happy, they shall
sit in the golden chair,

They shall splash at a ten-leagued canvas, with
brushes of comets' hair;

They shall have real saints to paint from—Peter,
Magdalene, Paul;

They shall paint for an age at a sitting and never
grow tired at all.

Then only the Master shall praise us, and only the
Master shall blame,

And no one shall work for money, and no one shall
work for fame;

But all for the joy of working, and each in his
separate star

Shall paint the things as he sees them, for the God
of things as they are.

—*Rudyard Kipling.*

THE BELIEVER ENTERS INTO HIS ETERNAL HOME.

What a glorious picture of the saint's final abode is presented to our rapturous view in the last two chapters of the Bible! Can it ever be adequately described? We think not. After all the descriptions of prose and poetry; after all the paintings upon canvas; after all our most magnificent word-painting, we must feel that we have failed to describe what in reality is beyond description. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." After all that we have read, and thought, and in fancy imagined, when, at last, our eyes shall behold the city that is fairer than day, we shall be compelled to say what the queen of Sheba said with regard to the splendor of Solomon's kingdom: "It was a true report that I heard in mine own land . . . Howbeit I believed not the words, until I came and mine eyes have seen it; and, now, behold, the half was not told me: thy wisdom and prosperity exceedeth the fame which I heard. Happy are thy men, and happy are these thy servants, which stand continually before thee."

The Eternal City! What a city! What foundations—garnished with all manner of precious stones! What gates—each several gate one great pearl! What walls—all of jasper! What streets—all of pure gold, like transparent glass! What company—God, the Lamb, angels, loved ones, the saints! What purity—nothing that defiles ever enters there! What light—there shall be no night there! What guardians—angels! A city not built with hands, nor hoary with the years of time! A city through whose streets creeps no hearse with its burden to the tomb! A city in which there are no deaths and no burials; where the name of widow and

orphan is unknown ; where there are no tears and no heartaches ! A city in which the inhabitants shall never say : " I am sick " ; where no fever makes the limbs to ache, or palsy stills life's activities ! What a city ! O God, grant, I pray Thee, that there may be no power in sin to blind my eyes, so that at the last I should miss that vision ; grant, O God, that there may be no power in sin to deafen my ears so that I should not be able to hear the grand anthem of Moses and the Lamb.

The Homeland, O the Homeland, the land of the
 free-born ;
 Lord, bring us all to the Homeland—not one of us
 missing—bring us *all* to the
 Homeland—the land of thy redeeming love.

I am content to have seen the City of God, and without weariness will I go nearer to it, and not all my life long will I suffer its bright golden gates to disappear from my sight.

Christian Educational Textbooks

By WILLIAM EVANS

EXPOUNDING THE WORD

The Great Doctrines of the Bible

Not theologically technical, but a masterly setting forth of what the Bible teaches about God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, Man, the Church, the Scriptures, Angels, Satan, and the Last Things.

277 pages, cloth bound, \$1.50 net, postage 10c

The Book of Books

What It Is; How To Study It. Part 1—Names of the Bible, inspiration, genuineness and authenticity, canon, versions, etc. Part 2—Interpretation, study methods—by books, chapters, topics, etc., concretely applied.

224 pages, cloth covers, \$1.25, postage 6c

Outline Study of the Bible

With Illustrative Charts. Affording a bird's eye view of the Bible—as a whole, of the two Testaments, of each book, historically, dispensationally, prophetically.

115 pages, cloth, 75c net, postage 6c

The Book Method of Bible Study

A fundamental method taught, and applied to Mal., John, Acts, Eph., Phil., Col., Heb., 1 John, and Rev.

127 pages, cloth, 75c net, postage 6c

What Every Christian Should Believe

Some fundamental doctrines set forth in relation to the Book and to vital faith, prepared especially for young and new converts.

128 pages, cloth bound, 90c net, postage 6c

The Shepherd Psalm

A Meditation. Beauty of outward form and appropriateness of subject matter combine most effectively in making this a gift book for almost any occasion.

84 pages, two colors, illustrated, silk corded, extension covers, 50c net

TRAINING FOR SERVICE MANUALS

How To Prepare Sermons and Gospel Addresses

The sound, sane character of this instruction makes the book serviceable to all Christian witnesses, but especially to those in training.

200 pages, cloth covers, \$1.25 net, postage 8c

Personal Soul-Winning

A Guide to Effective Methods. Written to prompt, encourage, and equip Christians in the great business of winning souls.

192 pages, cloth covers, \$1.25 net, postage 6c

How to Memorize

Convinces of the marvelous possibilities of the memory, and sets down simple fundamental rules for development that are certain to bring results. The Berean Band uses it extensively.

96 pages, cloth covers, 75c net, postage 6c

The Christian: His Creed and Conduct

The Christian in his relation to the Bible, to amusements, to business, to his family, and to his future reward.

128 pages, paper covers, 25c; cloth, 75c net, postage 6c

THE BIBLE INSTITUTE COLPORTAGE ASS'N

826 NORTH LA SALLE STREET, CHICAGO



357-BAB-284